

24360 1/2
4224.d.16.
A N
ANTIDOTE
AGAINST
ARIANISM:

BEING
A Short EXPOSITION of that
Part of the *Athanasian Creed*
which relates to the TRINITY.

WHEREIN
The Doctrine of the VITAL TRI-
NITY is set forth as Reasonable and
most Probable; and that of the Mo-
dal One is made more apparently Ab-
surd and Spurious.

By ERASMUS WARREN, Rector of
Worlington in Suffolk.

Veritas quidem obvia est, sed Requirentibus.
Minut. Fœl. in Octav.

LONDON, Printed by J. H. for Henry and George Mortlock
at the Phoenix in St. Paul's Church-Yard, 1712.

34134

At the Exposition of 1889



THE DOCTRINE OF THE

WITNESSES:

and that of the Mo-

and 2000

By Erasmus W. Allen, Reporter.

...in ...

1914

COPIES. Printed by J. M. King and Son, London.
and sold in the Strand, York.

THE PREFACE.

AS the Great GOD, Three in One, is the Highest Being in all the World; so they that undertake to explicate it, should do it (so far as may be) agreeably to it self. But if instead of that they write unsutably, and in a way so disparaging as rather to Libel the DEITY than duly Characterize it: surely their Errors (disgracefull to the ALMIGHTY) ought to be discover'd and confuted; and the Glorious GODHEAD more worthily exhibited.

When therefore I had seriously considered the Adorable TRINITY, and what the Best Writers have deliver'd concerning it; and found their Notions of it so very incongruous to its infinite Excellency: as I thought it my Duty to find out (if I could) a nobler and clear-

The Preface.

er way of explaining it ; so accordingly for a while I made it my chief Study.

And thus it appears that it was no slight Motive which inclin'd and induc'd me to the High Undertaking. For it was no less than to vindicate GOD Himself from unspeakable Wrongs done Him, by intolerable accounts given of His MAJESTY ; highly reproachfull both to Himself, and true Religion. Which as they came into the Church at first thro' Ignorance, Unwariness, and Inconsideration ; so there they have been maintain'd and unhappily propagated ever since by Custom and Inadvertency.

And truly where vain Doctrines and wild Opinions have been openly introduc'd, generally receiv'd, and so long continu'd as to get good footing ; we need not wonder that Men should be tenacious of them, and willing to retain them. For when Opinion grows too strong for Reason, and so far gets the ascendent of it, as to baffle and overcome it ; it can easily beat it down : and when it has done, not only keep it under, but also enslave it to capricious Whimsies. Especially where specious Phantasies have gain'd upon those in reputation for Learning, and have been countenanc'd, caress'd, and all along kindly entertain'd by such. Which indeed is the true, tho' deplorable Case to this very day, even as to the Doctrine of the HOLY TRINITY. For have not the Learned, the most Learned of all presented us with strange, and unaccountable, as well as unallowable Description-

The Preface.

scriptions of it? Such as to the intelligent that throly scan them, will be found to consist neither with solid Reason, nor sound and good Sense; and not only to be short of truth, but contrary to it. So that to a great deal written of the Blessed TRIAD even by Learned Pens, I may too fitly apply (a) Hermias his Expression. All is but darkness of Ignorance, and black mistake, and infinite error, and imperfect thought, and incomprehensible foolishness. For I must call black, black, especially in so weighty a case as this.

It was an high Charge, tho' a most improper one, that Festus gave St. Paul at Cæsarea; Thou art beside thy self, much Learning doth make thee mad. And tho' I do not apply it to our noted Writers upon the Sacred TRIAD; yet I'm fit to impute their Mistakes concerning it unto Learning. Not to true substantial Learning (the noblest Civil Accomplishment in the World;) but to that insipid, flashy sort of it which flourisht amongst the Men of the Schools; and contributed too much to corrupting Religion. For they having an exorbitant esteem and admiration for the Peripatetick Principles, and overvaluing that light sort of Knowledge; they drew down Metaphysicks, and the airy Notions of that empty

(a) Σκότος ἀγνοίας, ἅπαντα, καὶ ἀπάτη μέλαινα, ἀπειροπλάνη, καὶ ἀτελής φαντασία, καὶ ἀκατάληπτος ἀγνοία.
In Irris. Gentil. Philof.

The Preface.

Philosophy into their Theological Systems too freely. And by this means in part their Divinity was debas'd. So debas'd as to influence Religion, and at such a Rate, as to sink it too much; even so low in several Points as to make it very flat and degenerate.

Have we not evident Proofs of it? For notorious it is, that the main Article of Faith, a TRINITY in UNITY: and a chief Duty of Holy Practice, the Sacrament of the LORD's Supper: were thus most wretchedly depraved. Not only tinctur'd, but grievously tainted, (in a speculative sense) with gross Absurdities. The First in reference to its Doctrine; the Second as to vain and wild Opinions touching the Matter, or Elements of the Ordinance. And concerning Both, such things have been taught, and vehemently as well as openly urged; as are no more to be liev'd than the very Alcoran.

Which things when I often deeply and maturely consider'd, I was still more and more overwhelm'd with amazement, and so much inflam'd with just indignation; that I could not rest till I had finish'd what is here contain'd.

It is grounded upon a Piece of valuable Antiquity, the Athanasian Creed; which expresses the HOLY TRINITY in the most proper Terms, that ever any thing did in so narrow a compass. Tho' whether it was compos'd by that great Author or no, I shall not determine, because

The Preface.

because in Modesty I cannot do it ; our incomparable Church declaring her self diffident in that matter. For in the Title of it she stiles it, the Confession of our Christian Faith, commonly called the Creed of St. Athanasius. And by owning it is commonly so call'd, she shews her self doubtfull whether it were really His. But be it that Saints or not, it speaks most appositly of the TRINITY. I mean, as it pronounces it to be Three PERSONS in One ESSENCE. To which add but the words following, The FATHER is made of none, neither created, nor begotten ; The SON is of the FATHER alone, not made, nor created, but begotten ; The HOLY GHOST is of the FATHER, and of the SON, neither made, nor created, nor begotten, but proceeding : And then perhaps these four short but pithy Periods in this Creed ; will make out the GODHEAD's Personal Triplicity in Essential Unity, as well and fully as all Writers upon that Sacred Subject have done, in all their best Books, and most elaborate Treatises of it. And was not he a sagacious Writer that in way of Anticipation could præpitomize, or abridge so very many Volumes, in so very few Sentences, and so short ones ?

But because to explain the HOLY TRIAD competently, by that Hypothesis which this Symbol has been presum'd to go upon, or by any other yet extant, is impossible ; and so another must be found out if we would more

The Preface.

clearly understand it, as 'tis fit we should: why may not the **UNICAL** One be it? Let any therefore please to shew how, or by what way, the **TRINITY** consisting of Three Distinct **PERSONS**, in One Divine **ESSENCE**, can be better raised than by **WHAT**. The Request is made to the Pious and Learned with all possible Earnestness, and as humble Deference. And how extremely joyfull and thankfull should I be, to see it well answer'd? But till that is done. I shall be ready to insist upon this Demand. What is there in the most Glorious **TRINITY**, which the **UNICAL** Scheme does not more fully contain, and will not more fairly explicate; than any other yet recommended?

It is too well known how lasting and various Controversies have been about the Blessed **TRIAD**; and withal how very unhappy. For instead of Satisfaction resulting from advance in farther knowledge of it by high Disputes; the common Issue of them was usually unkind, or uncharitable Feuds. And if ever Scholastick Strifes, or Concertations touching it cease, and be brought to a wished Period; in likelihood it must be by a clearer insight into the Nature of its Constitution. To help towards which, I have publisht this Tract as having hope thereby of rendring it still more easy to be understood.

6 JU 62

As

The Preface.

As to what is here deliver'd, I have made it as familiar as the lofty Subject could well bear; thinking the more would better understand it, to GOD's Honour, and their own advantage: the Ends that I all along have aimed at, and to which that labour'd plainness of Style can be no hindrance, which I here use.

And now I make it my most humble and importunate Petition to The ALMIGHTY; that whatever I have written of this kind, may prosper no farther than it is Orthodox. And if any thing in it is opposite to Truth, or has the least tendency that way; may it be immediately and eternally blasted.

But after that Petition to the Great GOD, let me add this Request to eminently Good and Learned Men. In case my Essay upon the HOLY TRINITY comes into their Hands; let them not slight it because it is mine: nor suffer the meanness of the Writer to render what's written the more contemptible. That adorable GOD and SAVIOUR of ours, who appointed poor Fisher-men to reveal his most high and heavenly Truths; why should He not inable the least of his Ministers to elucidate and clear up this important Article, so much mistaken, and so long obscur'd?

Nor let the Work be despis'd as vain and needless. It is as necessary as it is to maintain GOD's essential Honour; or the Honour of his Glorious Being and Nature. For by the Hypothesis I am against, His transcendent Glories
are

The Preface.

are strangely disgrac'd, tho' not destroy'd ; as being shrunk up into Shadows, if not shrivell'd to Nothing. Nor is this the worst. For the bold Notionists that treat GOD so rudely, proceed farther, and are still more injurious to His MAJESTY. They attaque His PERSONS, as well as His Glories : and tho' they are boundless LIVES in his Blessed ESSENCE ; they unhappily abuse those adorable Hypostases by intolerable Disparagements. For suppose Men of wit and learning should think and say, declare and affirm, print and publish, and with all their Might maintain ; that the DIVINE PERSONS are chips, or straws ; or trifles, or shadows : would they not thus, insufferably disparage and avile Them ? And pray, what do they do less, who averr them to be Modes of Subsistence ? Put Straws, and Modes into the Balance, or bring them to the Touch stone of a sound Judgment ; and they'll be found of equal Weight and Worth : or if either exceed in levity, or baseness ; it must be Modes. But then can he be vain in his Attempt, who defends GOD's Honour in this highest Point, and against so bairous an Affront ?

Especially if we consider what pernicious Consequence the Doctrine of Modes here, may be of. For suppose, we were upon the great work of converting Infidels, and that good success had fitted many for Baptism. Then should some of those be so acute and penetrative (which many Unbelievers are) as to enter into deep dispute

The Preface.

dispute about FATHER, SON, and HOLY GHOST, in whose Names Baptism must be administered; and should drive things so far, as to find at last that They are trivial Modes: what may we presume would then be the Issue? Why, in all likelihood, they would condemn us Christians for our Religion; and then scorn our Religion upon GOD's account. And withal how would they ridicule us for, and upbraid us with our Devotions too? For by finding them directed to Modes, they would soon perceive the Objects of our Worship to be inferior to, and much worse than those of theirs; from which we would divert and draw them as unlawfull. For while we call and count them, rank Idolaters for adoring Images, tho' perhaps Golden Substances: what will they reckon us, when they understand we address to Modes, which to their Idols are but meer Shadows; and much sorrier things for Christians to prostrate to, and invoke by solemn Supplications? Especially when they seek to proselyte Heathens, and bring them over to their own Religion, because it is more sublime and pure. And then Heathens have this advantage of us. They may alledge, that they do not worship the bare Images, but the true GOD by and thro' them, whom they represent. But the very Modes which Christians adore are the very Divine PERSONS themselves; and consequently their Worship must terminate in the same: and they have no plea or apology to make for them-

The Preface.

themselves. So that let Ethnicks into a clear knowledge of the Modal Persons in the TRIAD; and doubtless they would despise, deride, and defy those highest Objects of our Adoration; and us as silly Worshippers of them, and more gross Idolaters than themselves. And truly I cannot forbear to say, that the Doctrine of wise Heathens touching the TRINITY, far surmounts ours; as to what School Doctors make its PERSONS to be, in their Mountebank Divinity.

As the SON of Sirach solemnly tells us, there is a Word that is cloathed about with Death, Ecclus. 23. 12. And is not that Word too much of this kind, whereby the mention'd Writers express the FATHER, SON, and HOLYGHOST? For 'tis such in short, as sinks down their superlative Excellencies so low in signification as to swallow them up in implicit Blasphemy; while they pronounce, and proclaim them, WODEX. Strange to think! that the Glorious Three should be so degraded, as to be openly call'd by no fitter Name; and generally to be counted no better things. If therefore that Word carries not Death along with it, it must be owing to that tender Pity which dwells in those, who by it are denominated and disparag'd. For it surely contains such vast disrespect and irreverence to, and such vile debasement, and diminution of their infinite MAJESTIES; that many who are thro'ly Good and Wise would rather chuse to die,

The Preface.

die, than profess Them to be what that speaks Them. And tho' I could heartily wish it had been otherwise, yet own I must, that as some ancient Fathers seem to lean that way; so generally Modern Authors of greatest Learning and Worth, have unhappily spt into the School-Mistakes; and have lessn'd themselves by adhering too close to their clumsy Perswasion.

But this I must note in deserved Praise of our Peerless Church (the purest upon Earth and the more pure for that:) That she never gave direct authoritative Countenance, to this vain and extravagant Doctrine of the TRINITY; either by Her Articles, Homilies, or Canons. In none of which the least mention, or intimation of it is to be found. Nor is it fit it should, tho happy that it is not.

For as GOD is the Highest, and most Glorious Being in the World, so our Ideas of Him should be sublime and futable: and when we attempt to describe his Nature, as we should do it with profoundest Reverence, so likewise in the aptest Language. Tho' neither so is it easy, nor indeed possible fully to set forth His MAJESTY. For even best Elocution must here fall short, extremely short of due Expression. Were our Breath a Stream of purest Oratory, and could it flow in Torrents of Eloquence, digested into finest elaborate Composures to set forth the Glories of the DEITY: instead of justly re-
pre-

The Preface.

presenting, they would only Eclipse and darken them. For so ineffably transcendent are they, that for any of us to strive to illustrate them, would be but to cloud and obscure their Brightness. For in truth, it is not in the power of Words to do GOD Right. Such is His superlative Dignity, that in their highest sense, and most dilated signification, they are too low and scant to reach it. So that when we offer verbally to extoll the ALMIGHTY, we do but depress Him; and while our stammering Tongues intend his Praise; in strictness they rather speak to His Prejudice.

Nay, even Things themselves are here as short and insufficient as Words. For make every Creature in the World a Letter, and then put the entire Creation together; yet still we should want a better Alphabet whereby to speak His Greatness.

But then when his Nature's so Incomprehensible, that little can be said in terms adequate to it; who shall apologize for the Modal Hypothesis of the TRINITY; and the monstrous folly and temerity of it: which makes the infinitely Glorious PERSONS there, no better than three sorry Modes? Excuse this perfectly nothing can; but surely the best way to Extenuate it, must be to think and say, it was a Sin of Ignorance. Which, for the future, may the Father of Lights graciously dispell by a brighter Knowledge.

But

The Preface.

But then surely it is incumbent upon us too to do our best here, to dissipate this unhappy Ignorance; and to clear up and increase our deficient knowledge, as soon and as much as we are able. And when in this case we have done our utmost, if then the best representation we can make of the TRINITY, be not so exactly true, as to be every way answerable to its glorious Self; yet were it so fairly drawn, as laudably to come up to it in all decent measures, and made so clear, as no just and considerable Exceptions could by the Judicious be brought against it: such a Description of it would be at once most usefull and necessary. For it would contribute much to GOD's Honour, to His Church's Credit, to the Ease of Good Christians, and to the Discouragement of Hereticks.

1st, To GOD's Honour. For how can it comport with his infinite Goodness, or consist with his infinite Wisdom, and so conduce to his Honour and Glory; to make the main Article of saving Faith to Christians, so puzzling and intricate: as that none of them yet could ever thro'ly understand it themselves, or explain it competently unto others? Nay, which is far worse, and so dishonouring to GOD as not to be endur'd; were Christians requir'd to believe the TRINITY according to the common Notion, or standing Model of it, in order to their future Bliss; they must then assent to a thing impossible, to a rank Contradiction, and to a notorious Lye, to obtain Salvation: even that
three

The Preface.

three meer Modes are three DIVINE PERSONS, and so every one of them GOD most truly.

2ly, It maintains the Church's Credit. For to believe and teach a VITAL TRIAD, highly agreeable to GOD's DIVINE Nature, and to humane Reason ; is a noble and becoming work, and fit to be done by the most holy and venerable Community. But for the Body of Christians to recommend unintelligible things, and to impose them on its Members ; and to induce People to swallow them, to tell them they are profound Mysteries, when they are perfect Non-sense ; what can be more infamous and dispanaging ? They that act in such a Scene, while they would teach others to see, do only proclaim their own Ignorance and Blindness.

3ly, It makes good Christians easy. How many Books have been written, and how many Disputes held about the TRINITY in UNITY ? And what Heats have these rais'd, and what Persecutions too ? To say nothing of those Disquietments and Distractions of Mind, which good People have suffer'd in relation to that Article. But the Doctrine of a VITAL TRINITY, throws out the Troubles which that of the Modal one occasion'd by throwing off the Difficulties which it contained.

Lastly, It Discourages Hereticks. When the Doctrine of the Modal TRIAD was so necessary to be believ'd, and yet impossible to be rationally understood ; this gave countenance

The Preface.

to the Church's Enemies. For when they invented extravagant figments, and urg'd them upon People as Orthodox Truths; and they refus'd to receive, because they could not understand them: they were ready to repell that answer with this suggestion: that tho' they did not understand the Doctrine of the TRINITY, yet they did believe it. But they that believe the VITAL TRIAD; can't be pinch'd with such an Allegation. A good advantage on its side, that it discourages the Heterodox more than the Modal one.

And when a fair Account, and plausible Description of it (tho' not strictly genuine and authentick) would be thus serviceable to GOD and Men at once, we may reasonably conclude (that from the need we have of it, and from the Ends and Interests which would be favour'd and forwarded by it,) that it is somewhere to be had. And the Doctrine of it being supernatural, it must be found in the sacred Scripture. There therefore I have been, and still am most humbly seeking for it.

And here I take leave to declare plainly, what I propos'd to my self in writing thus upon this glorious Subject. It was to work on Mens Minds, by informing their Judgments: and by enlightning their Understandings with clearer knowledge of GOD, to inflame their Affections towards Him, as well as mine own. For the more fully we understand the TRINITY of PERSONS, in

The Preface.

the Unity of the Divine Essence ; The more, without Question, we shall improve our Zeal in the Love and Service of the DEITY.

Indeed, ignoti nulla Cupido, is a Saying as true, as it is common ; what we do not know, we cannot love. And consequently the less we know a thing, the less we must affect it tho' never so incomparable. Look to a choice Friend, and the more Worth we discover in him, the more Love we shall have for him, and the more we shall value and admire him. And is it not, and must it not be so as to GOD Himself ? The more Excellencies we discern or perceive in his Being, the more fervent Love we shall have for His MAJESTY, and the more vehement and flaming Desires after Him. And when once we burn with such Fervours to Him, when shall we think that we can ever serve or obey Him enough ?

But then GOD's Nature consisting of Three PERSONS and One Essence, there must be a vast and inconceivable Difference between PERSONS that are LIVES, and PERSONS that are MODES : no less in truth, than there is between thinnest Shadows, and infinitely perfect Divine Subsistences. And so the attractive power to Duty in the one, must be infinitely superior in force and prevalence to those in the other. And consequently the knowledge of the VITAL PERSONS must be infinitely preferable to that of the MODAL Ones ; as being infinitely more influential and operative

The Preface.

to the highest good and greatest Ends and Purposes. Especially to induce us to Love GOD with Ardency, and to Serve Him with indefatigable and zealous Perseverance in all religious Duties.

And truly who would not chuse to Love, and love to Serve three Living Hypostases, or LIVES Divine, containing all manner of infinite Perfections, and warranted in Scripture; rather than three fictitious Modes, wild Inventions of the Phansifull? And tho' much has been written in defence and maintenance of the supposed Modes; yet were it worth the while, more Volumes might be fill'd with the shamefull Absurdities, which attend that weak, and wild, and wretched Hypothesis.

In a word; some having doubted a TRINITY, and others having deny'd it, and others having thought strangely of, and entertain'd very uncouth Notions concerning it; the better to inform their Judgments touching it, and to inflame their Affections, and raise their Devotions towards it: I have here endeavour'd to offer a more proper and clear; and would gladly say, a true and genuine Account, or Explication of the same.

And because my Hypothesis goes upon Lives, I shall take a transient tho' general view of the Lives; wherewith the Creatures in this World of ours, are respectively individuall and actuated. And as I go along shall make such Observations, as in Reason and Philosophy may yield a

The Preface.

good Basis, whereon to raise an agreeable Scheme of the most Glorious TRIAD.

And first I note, that in sundry sorts of Creatures there are several kinds of Life.

Thus for instance, even in Stones, (to say nothing of Metals, or other Fossils) there is Life. According to which they grow, and ripen, till they come to such perfection as to be usefull in their kinds.

There is Life also in Grass, and Weeds, whereby they spring and thrive; and yield respective Seeds for Propagation; and so become common Food for Animals that are not carnivorous, and feed not upon Grain, Flies, &c.

There is Life in Herbs and Flowers likewise; by which they put forth and flourish. And as many of them are good for Food or Physick; so others entertain us with inimitable Colours, and finest Beauties; perfume the Air with pleasing Odours; and refresh us with delicious Fragrancies.

There is Life moreover in Plants. As in Timber-Trees, Fruit-Trees, &c; which are of great and various Use and Benefit, in themselves, and in their products. But then the Life which invigorates all these foregoing things, is of the lowest Quality. For it lifts them up no higher than Accretion, or Growth; and to their proper and Specifick Frustrifications. And so at best it can be but Vegetative Life.

Next

The Preface.

Next there is Life in Brutes, which comes nearer to our own. For by virtue of it they do not only wax till they come to a just Height and Magnitude ; and move and generate their respective Kinds ; but moreover they See, and Hear, and Feel, and Taste, and Smell ; and so have as many Senses (and divers of them quicker ones) than our selves. And from many of them we receive much Benefit, in way of helpfull Service (as well as Sustenance) because their Life is Sensitive.

But then in the last place (to come home to our selves) in Mankind there is a Rational Life, which sets us much above the Brutal Rank. For by that Reason which our Life contains (besides the exercise of our Senses) we Think, and Understand, and Discourse, and Remember, &c. which no Creatures below us can do.

*Nay, by virtue of the Rational Life we have the honour of being Persons ; which only intelligent Life can advance us to, and adorn and innoble us with. And therefore a Person by the Learned is agreed to be *Υποστασμενον νοερον*, an Intellectual or Understanding Subistence.*

And which is more, this rational and intelligent Life qualifies us for the Divine one, as it capacitates us to receive the divine Virtues and influences of Heaven ; and to hold communion with GOD. But then if rational Life be so exalting as to lift up our Beings into Per-

The Preface.

sons; from thence we may conclude, that the Three infinite Lives in the DEITY, must be Three infinite PERSONS, by reason of that infinite Reason or Understanding which they do possess. Yet at the same time this teaches us clearly why every Man is but one Person, tho' he has three Lives; even because but one of them is rational.

Should any object that every Man has a Soul, as well as a Life, and so he may better be a Person, than there can be any in the GODHEAD: I answer. GOD has a SOUL too, and has openly declar'd as much. Your appointed feasts my Soul hateth, Isai. i. 14. Mine Elect in whom my Soul delighteth, Chap. 42. i. My Beloved in whom my Soul is well pleased, S Mat. 12. 18. Now what is GOD's Soul but his Spirit, or Essence, which being actuated by every one of the Divine LIVES, is as a particular Soul to each of them. And then why should not three Divine LIVES in GOD (which are above Rational ones) be three Divine PERSONS in his SOUL; as well as one Reasonable LIFE in Man's Soul, should make him one humane Person?

And to GOD if we lift up our serious and awfull Thoughts; we shall find that in him is Life too, and that to utmost Perfection. And therefore as in Scripture he is often said to be the LIVING GOD; so his Title in 1 Tim. 6. 16. is, *Ὁ μόνος ἔχων ἀθανάσιον*; Who alone

The Preface.

lone hath Immortality. *That is naturally, Essentially, and in the most singular way, and superlative measure ; or rather infinitely, and so unmeasurably. Which adorable Life of His were I to describe : at present I should most humbly do it thus. It is the Highest and Noblest infinite Excellency, or Perfection, in GOD's Nature or Being ; upon which as all his Intellective and Active Powers do depend, so from it they seem to issue or proceed. To render this the more intelligible, I go on to observe,*

Secondly, That according to the Kind, or Quality of the Lives in any Beings, such are the Excellencies, or Perfections in their Natures. And then whence can those Powers and innate Perfections flow but from their respective Lives ? And consequently the lower or higher their several Lives are, their Excellencies and Perfections will and must correspond to the same. And does it not plainly appear so to be from the sundry Lives now instanc'd in ?

Thus, Stones, and all Fossils ; Grass, and all Weeds ; Herbs, and all Flowers ; Plants, and all Trees ; having only Vegetative Life ; Their highest Excellency is but to increase, or grow on to their appointed Pitch ; and to yield their proper various Products.

Brutes indu'd with Sensitive Life, act their part in sutable Scenes. That is, they eat, and drink, and sleep, and breed, and do some few

The Preface.

things as they are taught : but in nothing can they rise above their Rank, and the low degree of Animal Life.

Tho' Men being impregnated with Rational Life, they excell as much in noble Faculties ; and by using them wisely may exert and signalize themselves in truly great and worthy Achievements. For they may rise high not only in Mechanick Arts, and the Liberal Sciences ; but in the much more valuable Excellencies of Morality and Religion. Which will surely crown the eminent in them, not only with true Honour, but with heavenly Bliss, and immortal Glories.

But to carry on the Vital Account I am giving, in true measures and just or adequate proportions to its height ; I must add, That GOD having a natural, necessary, and infinitely perfect Life ; that must naturally be attended with as Infinite Excellencies in his Nature: and so it is. And therefore all who confess He is the ever-living GOD ; own that in him there is infinite Goodness, and the like Mercy, Love, Holiness, Justice, Truth, Wisdom, Power, &c. But then from whence should these come but from his Life ? For as all the little Perfections in Creatures, rise from their respective Lives, and answer to the Qualities, and Degrees of them ; so why should not all infinite Excellencies in GOD Himself, flow from his Life too, it being infinitely Perfect ? For when low and mean Lives, can yield Perfections answerable to them?

The Preface.

themselves; why (in way of meet analogy) should not infinitely Perfect Divine Excellencies result from as infinitely Perfect and Divine Lives? And then how easy would it be to form a Fair Idea of the Life of GOD? I mean, by conceiving it to be a sublimer Excellency than the rest of his Perfections, the Source, or Fountain of them all, and that which supports them every one, and continues them in an active State. For could the Life of GOD expire, they must instantly sink down into an eternally dead Quiescence; as being as unable to subsist in GOD without Life, as He would be unable to Sustain and Exercise them.

*But Life in this World being every where, and in all Kinds of it so spritely and energetick, as to propagate it self by innate vigour which prompts it thereunto; why should we not suppose that Divine Life in the DEITY may do the same? Here therefore I drop this Third Note as very probable. That the Divine, Infinite, and most Sovereign Life in the GOD-HEAD, is prolifick or propagative of it self. And why should it not be so all things considered? Particularly when holy Scripture plainly authorizes us to think so, and is ready to confirm and authenticate that thought? For when the FATHER expressly declares, S. Joh. 5. 26. that as He hath Life in himself, so He hath given to the SON to have Life in himself; and when over and over He proclaims him to
be*

The Preface.

be his Son, and his Begotten Son, and the only Begotten of the FATHER, and his first Begotten: what does he less than assure us, that DIVINE LIFE in Himself is as Propagative in its own most Glorious way, as other Lives are?

And when the same GOD the FATHER is pleas'd to inform us farther, that the HOLY GHOST proceedeth from Himself, St John 15. 26. and signifies that He does the same from his SON too, by calling Him the SPIRIT of his Son, Gal. 4. 6; and the SPIRIT of JESUS CHRIST, Phil. 1. 19; and the SPIRIT of CHRIST, 1 S. Pet. 1. 11: what is this his Proceſſion from both, but a kind of divine Propagation found peculiarly in the GOD-HEAD again, and most gloriously agreeable to it? So that in Truth the Vegetative, Sensitive, and Rational Lives, according to their several kinds, are not more naturally and really propagated and transmitted, to Plants, Brutes, and Men; than Divine Life is deriv'd from one Subsistence to another in the ever Blessed DEITY which is above. Which here gives occasion to a

Fourth Note, or Observation. That all the PERSONS of the Glorious GODHEAD, must be Similar, and Equal. For LIFE in the FATHER being DIVINE LIFE, and that LIFE being Infinite, and infinitely Perfect in Him; how could He when he begat the SON transfuse any other LIFE into Him? Or
how

The Preface.

how could They, when They Breathed the HOLY GHOST, but impart that very LIFE to Him, as having no other to communicate? And is not this exactly agreeable to GOD's own Procedure, and the regular measures which he has appointed to other Beings? For do we not see? as the three sorts of Life continually propagate, so they propagate none but their own proper and respective Kinds of Life. The Vegetative, that is, propagates Life of its own Quality only; and the Sensitive and Rational do the same. And when all sorts of Life in this World do thus; why may we not suppose even in Reason, and according to true Philosophy, that the DIVINEST LIFE in GOD Himself does the Like, in way of lofty and transcendent analogy? But then as Vegetative, Sensitive, and Rational Lives, are all alike, and equal according to their Kinds in their Respective Ranks, or Orders; so why should not the DIVINEST LIVES of all be the same? especially when we are infallibly assur'd that That very LIFE does propagate it self? And then all DIVINE LIVES being of the same Nature and Kind; for that reason they must naturally be alike, and equal, so far as Propagation on their parts extends.

Indeed the FATHER begetting the SON, in Order and Relation He must be before him. Which I take to be the meaning of great Athanasius, where speaking of the most holy FATHER of CHRIST, he pronounces
Him

The Preface.

Him (a) above or beyond all generated Being: and so in order above the SON because he did beget him. But must not the water of the Stream be of the same nature with that in the Fountain from which it flows? GOD is said to be a fountain of Life, Psal. 36; and so he was to his Eternal SON when he begat him: but then must not the Life in the FATHER, and in the SON; in the Fountain, and in the Stream, be alike, and equal? Where did we ever find? or when did we hear that Father and Son were not alike, and equal in their Nature? And are we like to find them unlike and unequal here in the Instance I am upon? So far from that, that all good Orthodox Christians believe the contrary, and have long done so, and openly profess'd as much. For ever since the Nicene Creed was us'd, they have not only acknowledg'd him to be the only begotten SON of the FATHER; but have own'd him to be (b) very GOD of very GOD. Where the Greek is somewhat more emphatical than the English. For our LORD is not said to be ἀπὸ, from GOD, or διὰ, by GOD, as if GOD had made Him, or created Him; but He is ἐκ Θεοῦ, out of GOD, as issuing forth from Him in way of Generation: by virtue of which, he is properly said to be ἀληθινὸν ἐξ ἀληθινῆς: True GOD of true

(a) Ὑπερκεῖνα πάντι γεννητῆς οὐσίας.

(b) Θεὸν ἀληθινὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ ἀληθινῆς.

The Preface.

GOD. *And before this, Justin Martyr in his Dialogue with Trypho the Jew, tells us, that GOD before other Creatures were brought forth, begat of Himself Δύναμιν τινὰ λογικὴν, a certain rational Power, which was sometimes called GOD, and sometimes the LORD, &c; whereby he meant the Eternal SON. Whose Generation, says (a) Irenæus, is inexpressible, and known to none: that is, the manner of it, for the thing it self is sufficiently manifest. And as by virtue of it the SON is a LIFE in the DEITY; so He is truly said to live by the FATHER, S. Joh. 6. 57: and that in as high and deep a sense, as any whom He has made and redeem'd, shall live by Him; as he there gives us to understand. But then the SON being as true a Divine LIFE as the FATHER, He cannot but be like Him and equal to Him. Yet when the SON is said to be equal to the FATHER, it is to be understood with prudent Caution; that He is as equal to him as he that is begotten can be equal to him that begat him. And when the HOLY GHOST is pronounced equal to the FATHER and the SON, the Word must be taken in a duly qualifi'd sense; that He who is emissive, or processive from them, is as equal as he can be to those by whom he is emitted, and from whom he does proceed. Tho' between*

(a) Li. 2. c. 48. Inenarrabilis itaq; generatio ejus cum sit, &c.

The Preface.

the FATHER on the one side, and the SON and HOLY GHOST on the other; there is as much difference as can be between a Being Self-originated, and those that are Derivative from it. And then, certain it is, that in point of coordinative Parity they must differ.

*And in other cases also wise allowance must be made, tho' here I mention but Two. One is the Case of Supremacy. For tho' the SON is declar'd GOD BLESSED for ever over all, Rom. 9. 5: yet when some Believers gave that title, in the stretch of it, to our SAVIOUR while Origen lived; he censur'd and reprov'd them for it, telling them it was done, *διὰ τὴν προέρεαν*, rashly, or unadvisedly. The other case is Eternity. I am Alpha and Omega, says CHRIST, Rev. 1. 8. Now admit the Words shew, the Coæternity of the SON with the FATHER, according to the English Annotations. Yet is there not? and must there not be Difference between their Eternities, when that of the FATHER is most Absolute; and the SON's Dependent on His?*

According to the Hypothesis I am upon, a Fifth Note or Observation here may very well be this. That the Generation of the Eternal SON, and the Breathing of the Eternal SPIRIT, are not solely Acts, or Effects of the Divine Will. It is a Question amongst Divines, whether the Second and Third PERSONS in the Sacred TRIAD, are from Necessity, or from GOD's Will. Now GOD, I mean

The Preface.

mean the **FATHER**, always existing Natural-ly, and Necessarily (which if He had not done, He could never have been :) it seems very agreeable, that the Generation of the **SON**, and the Spiration of the **HOLY GHOST**, should be so far Necessary, as they are Natural. And the Scripture, I think, is not so silent as to Both Notions; but that it hints, if not determines which of them is most probable. For it plainly declares, as has been said; that the **FATHER**, which is the first Life, begat the **SON**, which is but Divine Propagation. And that the **HOLY GHOST** which is the Third, proceeded from those two; another way of Divine Propagation. And then what remains but that the **SON** and **SPIRIT** rose in the **DEITY** in a Propagative way; and so naturally and necessarily? Not that this Rise tho' was at all against, or without the **FATHER's** Will. For so long as it was done in compliance with, and by the Energy of his Nature, it could never be contrary to his Will. Whatever therefore the Learned might say as to this Problem, upon the old Hypothesis; in this new one there seems to be no room for such a Question; or for disputes about it. But when that **LIFE**, which is **GOD** the **FATHER**, was absolutely necessary; that the **LIFE** which is the **SON**, and that that which is the **HOLY GHOST** (both deriv'd from His) should be the same in their capacity, would be no way incongruous, but rather a Divine Honour, and
Ma-

The Preface.

Majestick Dignity. I mean, that They should be as necessary by natural and eternal Generation and Procession; as He was naturally and eternally Self-existent. Agreeably to which I remember, famous Bishop Bull discoursing of the SON's being born when the FATHER will'd he should; makes (a) Velle illud Patris, æternum, that Will of GOD to have been eternal. And why the SON must have been eternal, tho' he had been born at the Will of GOD, Gregory Nyssen gives a proper and valid reason. GOD always willeth that which is good, and Power accompanying that Will, (b) therefore it is to be thought the SON has ever been with the FATHER.

And here with regard to the Two last foregoing Observations, this Question may be put. Whether Christians Prayers should be so nicely regulated as to be directed primarily to the FATHER, thro' CHRIST, and by the HOLY SPIRIT? which some have observ'd, was not unusual in former Ages. To it I answer. The FATHER, SON, and HOLY GHOST are all Divine LIVES; and as they illiven and actuate the same infinite Essence, they are all Divine PERSONS. And then as such we are to pay holy Worship to them every one, They be-

(a) In Defens. §. 3. cap. 8.

(b) Αἰ ἀρχαὶ ὁ Υἱὸς μετὰ τῷ ΠΑΤΡΙ ὁνομαζέται.
Cont. Eunom. li. 8.

The Preface.

ing all truly GOD. Yet at the same time we are seriously to consider, that the FATHER being a Self-originated and Self-existent LIFE; and the SON and HOLY GHOST LIVES Derivative and Communicated: it may seem reasonable and just upon that account, that our Adorations and holy Services should be directed primarily and principally to GOD the FATHER. And then we offering them duly up to HIM, through the Merits of CHRIST, who is our High-Priest, our only Mediator, and our great and powerfull Advocate; and by the aid of the HOLY GHOST, who in Prayer, and pious Duties is to inspire us, and by His gracious influence to help our Infirmities: we might so expect, that our sacred Performances would become more acceptable unto GOD, and to our selves the more beneficial. And this very thing, to serious Observers, will plainly appear to be frequently done by our Church in her excellent Liturgy.

But yet how plausible soever this Practice or procedure may seem; I do not see where it is openly and explicitly injoin'd, or laid upon us as a Duty indispensable. Tho' I cannot but say, that the very LORD's Prayer, if rightly consider'd, in it's full Latitude, will give countenance to it. For touching it he hath requir'd, (a) when ye

(a) S. Luke 11. 4.

The Preface.

pray, say, Our FATHER which art in Heaven, &c. So that allowing it to be either a Form, or Rule of Prayer, we must pray by it, or according to it. If we pray by it as a Form, in its compleat length; we ascribe Dominion, Power and Glory to GOD the FATHER, in its concluding Words: (a) For thine is the Kingdom, and the Power, and the Glory, for ever. Amen. But then how is this done in, or thro' CHRIST? That will soon appear. For as CHRIST commands us to ask in his Name, in the 16th of S. John, so at 23th verse of that Chapter, to tempt us to it he assures us, that whatever we ask the FATHER in his Name, he will give it us. And when by his command we are to use this Form constantly, and in his Name; must we not as often as we use it, in, or thro' CHRIST, give Dominion, Power, and Glory to GOD?

Or if we take this Prayer of our LORD, for a Rule, or Pattern of framing Prayers by; and in answer to it draw up Prayers of our own; if we compose them rightly according to it, we must still do the same thing in other words: That is, give Dominion, Power, and Glory unto GOD the FATHER, in and thro' CHRIST, for ever. Amen.

(a) S. Mat. 6. 13.

The Preface.

But then when the Doxologick Clause is quite left out by S. Luke, another Evangelist who records this Prayer; may not that somewhat weaken the Argument alledg'd for giving Glory to GOD the FATHER chiefly in or thro' CHRIST, when we Pray? For where as much is done to hinder a thing (without plain contradiction, which in things divine is unallowable) as is done to promote it; it seems to be left in equilibrio, or to be of indifferent Nature, or Use. Yet the truth is, giving Glory to GOD the FATHER in Devotional Addresses to Heaven, was pretty much the Primitives Usage.

But then I must add, that tho' the LORD's, which is a perpetual Form, or Rule for Christian Prayer; gives glory to the FATHER in or thro' the SON; and our excellent Church often does the same in her incomparable Liturgy, and constant Practice: Yet here in this Prayer nothing is mention'd, or in the least hinted, as to doing the same by or thro' the HOLY GHOST. So that after all, the Devout in this Case being as free from sacred Obligation as from civil Injunction; they are very much left to their own Discretion. Tho' should right apprehension of the FATHER's Præminence in Self-originated Excellency; induce any to direct their Devotions to him, primarily, by and thro' the SON and HOLY SPIRIT (in other respects like Him and Equal to Him:) this in-

The Preface.

stead of being faulty, would be very approveable. He being really what he has stil'd Himself, Psal. 95. 3. The LORD the Great GOD, and the Great King above all GODS. As high and suitable a Title as any He has assum'd to Himself.

Lastly, I observe; That of all things in the vast Universe, infinitely perfect LIFE is most fit to raise the ever Blessed TRINITY, which consists of Three Living PERSONS in One ESSENCE. To make this the more intelligible, let us suppose the ESSENCE which is as the Basis of the Glorious TRIAD, to be an Infinite SPIRIT, as it has all along been thought. What then shall the Three distinct Infinite PERSONS of it be, if they are not LIVES? Either they must be Substances, or Accidents. To suppose them Accidents, would be to make them much meaner than our selves. And if they be Substances, they must either be Material, or Spiritual ones. Material ones they can't be because GOD is a SPIRIT, S. Joh. 4. 24. And as he is Spiritual in his Essence, so in his PERSONS he must be the same; for one of them is the HOLY SPIRIT. And he Proceeding from the FATHER and the SON, he must needs be of the same Nature with them, as issuing directly and immediately from them. If the Three PERSONS be Spiritual ones, they in conjunction with the Essence will be four Spirits; and being all infinitely Perfect, as the
Divine

The Preface.

Divine Essence and Persons must be; they would inevitably be three, if not four GODS. And so very far from a TRINITY of PERSONS in an UNITY of ESSENCE.

But allow the Divine ESSENCE to be an infinite eternal SPIRIT, quicken'd and actuated by Three Distinct LIVES; the First naturally and from eternity springing up in it, and as naturally and eternally begetting the Second LIFE; and they two by a like propagative Power Breathing or sending forth a Third, in which the prolifick force or virtue of Divine LIFE was fully spent, and did finally terminate: and the Adorable TRINITY is most Perfectly and Gloriously constituted, and I think intelligibly enough. For as here is an infinite SPIRIT which is the Essence, and so is the Root, or Head of the TRINITARIAN UNITY; and which being common to all the Three LIVES that are in it, is equivalent to a particular Essence to each of them: so those LIVES being in that Essence and vitally actuating it, and being infinitely Perfect, and so most rational and intelligent, they actually become a Personal TRINITY in the aforesaid Essential UNITY. They who cannot understand this, I wish they could.

And why should not this vital Scheme of the Holy TRIAD pass as lawfull or probable (which I do not recommend as strictly genuine) when in the Scripture the PERSONS of it are

The Preface.

So plainly termed LIVES ? and nothing in the whole World so highly, so nobly, so transcendently Excellent as Life of all Sorts ? For instance,

How does the Vegetative Life fill and furnish the Bowels, and adorn and garnish the Surface of the Earth, with curious and delightfull Varieties of pleasing ; as well as with necessary Stores of usefull things ?

With what rich and wonderfull Plenty of rarely admirable, as well as serviceable Animals, does the Sensitive Life stock the Seas and Rivers ; and replenish all Countries and Kingdoms by Land ?

And as to Mankind, to make them happier, they are honour'd with a Rational, a much higher Life. And as they do abound ; so by the help of that how many, and what mighty and magnificent things are attempted and effected ; attained and enjoyed by them ?

And to pass by Angels (who have a Life superior to ours, and are capable of sublimer things than we) lastly let us lift up the Eyes of our Minds, and in solemn Contemplation look as high as we can : I mean, to GOD, the most infinitely good and perfect Being that ever was, or can exist. And let us well consider the Perfections of his Nature, the Issues of his Power, and the Works of his Providence. And let us well consider, how unspeakable,
how

The Preface.

how inconceivable, and how amazing and astonishing they are. Yet after all, consider as seriously what is the most peerless and unparalleled Excellency he has, but his infinitely perfect LIFE? Are not his chief Perfections deriv'd from that? are they not sustain'd by that? are they not invigorated by that? Take LIFE from GOD, and (I speak it with humblest reverence) He is, He can be GOD no more. But then that Sovereign, that Infinite, that infinitely Perfect LIFE, which supports the infinitely great and glorious GOD of Heaven and Earth; must surely be the fittest thing in the World, to constitute the Eternal TRINITY; and what else can do it better? or at all? Thus have I somewhat anticipated the Contents of this Exposition. But I matter not observing strictness of Method, so I fairly gain my Point. I mean, either by establishing a probable Hypothesis of the sacred TRINITY: or else by giving check to wild and wrong Notions of it, which to it were and must be shamefully diminishing and disgracefull, if but slightly reflected on, and superficially consider'd. For, for Christians to enjoy the Blessed Gospel almost 1700 Years; to be Baptiz'd into the Faith of a TRINITY, and to own and successively profess that they believ'd it as a prime and fundamental Article: and yet during all those Centuries, to have no

The Preface.

Notions of it even amongst the most Learned and Wise ; but what was light, and vain, and empty ; silly, impertinent, and nonsensical ; to say no worse (if search'd to the Bottom :) is not this sad and dismal to consider ?

Yet this was not the worst neither, for when People, and the most learned of all were in the dark as to this high Point ; they did not only rest contentedly in it, but took an ill Course and effectual care to lock themselves fast up in the Error ; and so to live and die in it. For they determin'd it to be a profound Mystery, and then never attempted to unfold it, as concluding it to be inexplicable.

But for my own part I declare, that it will be very hard for me to think, that the Doctrine of the HOLY TRIAD, which the meanest assent to at their initiation into CHRIST ; and are to adhere to, and to profess ever after : should be deeply Mysteious, or so cloudy and obscure as not to be competently understood.

Some things I grant, of great importance may be deliver'd to us in Scripture not very clearly. But this may not imply or speak them Mysteries. But GOD having indu'd us with Reason and Understanding, and very quick and piercing Faculties ; He may shade and darken some Passages in his Word, to try what care and pains we'll

The Preface.

we'll take, and how we'll use our parts and exercise our powers to find out the true and just meaning of them. And accordingly we are injoin'd, *ἐκυνάρε τὰς γραφὰς*, S. John 5. 39. Search the Scriptures. That is, search them diligently, search them narrowly, search them studiously and painfully; doing our utmost to trace and find out the Truth. But if here we'll be supine and sluggish, and neglect thro' sloth, to seek for the precious Truth we might find; no wonder if we fall into gross Error, and even for ages lie grovelling in it. This is my Body; and this is my Blood; with too many others, are sad and deplorable, as well as notorious Proofs and Instances of as much.

But to draw towards a conclusion of this Preface. The great and incurable fault of the Modal Hypothesis of the TRINITY is, that it makes the Three PERSONS in it to be the One Substance. Tho' indeed They can't possibly be otherwise, when they are but the Divine ESSENCE it self Three ways variously modified, and related. And therefore not only the School Divines, but the very Fathers themselves, so far as they run upon this Notion, or go by this Rule or Measure; where they intend to assert, and strive to establish the TRINITY in Unity; do in reason but subvert, and utterly destroy, or finally exclude it.

For if the Three PERSONS be all Substance; then as Three truly and really Distinct PERSONS

The Preface.

SONS (which They certainly are) they must be Three truly and really Distinct Substances. And which is more, they must also be Three infinitely Perfect intelligent Substances; because every **PERSON** in the **GODHEAD** can be no less than infinitely Perfect, and intelligent. And so the Three **PERSONS** being Three distinct and infinitely Perfect intelligent Substances; They must of Necessity be Three **GODS**, there is no avoiding it.

But now admit the Glorious **THREE** in the **DEITY**, to be three **VITALITIES**; that is, Three Infinite Perfections, Powers, or Principles, which are **LIFES**; and so not Substances, tho' Higher and Nobler than They; and that these **LIFES** actuate and illiven the Substance of the **GODHEAD**: and there will be the **TRINITY** of **PERSONS**. And then admit farther, that these Three do eternally spring up in, and rise out of the Substance of the **GODHEAD**; and there will be a **TRINITY** of **PERSONS**, in a **UNITY** of **ESSENCE**. And that so plain and obvious as with a little help to be made very intelligible, even to those of common Capacity.

I now end all with this Caution. I am very sensible, as having long observ'd it, that the Christian Fathers did commonly think and teach; that where **GOD** in Scripture is said of old to appear to Men. and converse with them; tho' the Title **JEHOVAH** were assum'd by him,
and

The Preface.

and Divine Worship were given to him, and accepted: Yet they generally understood the Messiah or SON of GOD to have been the Person that still appeared upon all occasions. Bishop Bull also notes this, and relates it to be the Opinion of the Ancients, that (a) GOD the FATHER hath been seen of none, nor can He be seen by assum'd appearances. Now tho' for the pious Ancients I have all due esteem; yet in this (b) Exposition, to their general Rule I make Exception in two Cases, and I think upon just and good Grounds. The first is GOD's appearing to Moses, Exod. 34. when he had told him plainly (c) he could not see his Face; and gave him this reason why; for there shall no Man see my face and live. Which intimates, or rather argues it was GOD the FATHER who then appeared unto Moses: and therefore had he seen his face it would have been fatally over-powering to him. But when GOD the SON appeared and even in greatest State and Majesty, his face was seen by several Mortals without dying. As by Ezekiel at the River Chebar, Ezek. 1. 26. And by Daniel at the River Hiddekel, Dan. 10. 5. And by S. John the Divine Apocalypst, Rev. 1. 13.

(a) DEUS PATER a nemine unquam, ne per assumptas quidem species visus est aut videri potest. Defen. Sect. 4. cap. 3.

(b) See Artic. 5th.

(c) Exod. 33. 20.

And

The Preface.

And tho' the Sight of CHRIST's Face who is Eternal GOD was very dreadfull, and terribly affecting; yet it was killing to none, as the vision of the FATHER's face would have been. The other Case was, when GOD shewed Himself not to Moses only, but to Aaron, Nadab, Abihu, and the Jewish Elders, Exod. 24th. And as 'tis there said that they saw GOD, so in all likelihood it was GOD the FATHER; care being taken that they should not see his Face.

For there is no mention made of any thing of him being visible, but his Feet. And therefore says Osiander, they saw His Feet only. And so he might shew them but his Back-parts, as after that he did professedly to Moses, tho' I cited that instance first. And accordingly Grotius calls what they together beheld, *formam quandam valde lucidam, velut hominis tergum obvertentis*. A certain lucid form, as if a Man turned his Back upon them. Junius makes the GOD they saw to be (a) Signs of his Presence. As the Glory of the LORD, the Devouring fire, and the Cloud mention'd in the two last verses of that Chapter. From which the English Annotations do not much vary. (b) The seeing here meant, is when somewhat is obvious to our Sence, whereby we

(a) Signa præsentiæ Ejus.

(b) In loc.

The Preface.

have cause to conceive that GOD is present in an especial and extraordinary manner. By all which it seems probable that GOD the FATHER here appeared, by reason his face was so concealed. And this may be a great reason why GOD the FATHER has not convers'd so frequently and familiarly with Men; because the sight of his glorious Face would have put an end to their Mortal Life. And who knows but great Moses upon Mount Nebo might be sweetly ravish'd to Death by that? Who as the Rabbies tell us, Died at the Kisses of GOD's Mouth. O blessed and desirable Death!

THE RECORD

...to cable to convince him GOD is ...
...an official and confidential ...
...it all added in some ...
...1711 R but appeared ...
...not contradicted. And the way ...
...was GOD the Father ...
...it is frequently ...
...the ...
...and ...
...the ...
...the ...
...the ...

6 JU 62

GOD'S ...
...and ...

ERRATA.

Page 33. line 24. for *do that*, read *be so*. p. 35. l. 24. r. *then*. p. 56. l. 24. r. *Word*. p. 57. l. 23. before, *says*, insert, *for*. p. 72. l. 23. for *Isalem*, r. *Isalem*: and so wherever *Isalem* occurs. p. 153. l. 23. r. *וְיָ*. p. 182. l. 4. r. *vaedh*. And again l. 14. And in the Margent there, r. *וְיָ*. p. 198. l. 20. r. *calls*. p. 199. in the Margent, r. *Δόξα*. l. 6. p. 211. l. 22. for *were*, r. *was*. p. 252. l. 27. blot out *when*.



A N

ANTIDOTE

AGAINST

ARIANISM, &c.

ARTICLE I.

WHosoever will be saved :
before all things it is
necessary that he hold
the Catholick Faith.

Which Faith, except every one do
keep whole and undefiled: without
doubt he shall perish everlastingly.

EXPOSITION.

AS GOD was pleas'd to make our Nature
High ; so he design'd that in the End
we should be glorious and happy. But then
every End must be attain'd by suitable
B Means ;

2 *An Antidote against Arianism.*

Means ; so his Wisdom has furnisht us with admirable *Instruments*, exactly fitted to procure those Glories and Felicities, which he has prepared *for*, and promised *to us* : and amongst these a chief one is Faith.

This the Scripture plainly informs and assures us of. For as *the Just shall live by Faith*, Rom. 1. 17 ; so *without Faith* neither Spiritual, nor Eternal Life can be gained by us. For he that would acquire *either* must come to GOD, which no Unbeliever *can* do ; for *he that cometh to GOD must believe*, Heb. 11. 6. and *to him we have access by Faith*, Rom. 5. 2. And tho' now by the divine Favour we may in CHRIST obtain Salvation ; yet it must be thro' the efficacy of Faith ; for *by Grace ye are saved thro' Faith*, Eph. 2. 8. Besides ; all that would be saved must *please* GOD ; but *without Faith* it is *impossible* to do *that*, as the SPIRIT tells us. How well therefore, how excellently well, doth *this Creed* begin with declaring the *necessity* of a *true Faith* ; or of our firmly believing the Fundamentals of CHRIST's Religion, and all the *Catholick Doctrines* of it ? So call'd, because they have been *generally* held, or *universally* profess'd by all Good Christians, at all times, and in all places.

And therefore, if all they to whom the Gospel, teaching *this Faith*, is revealed, and of whom consequently it may be reasonably required, do not receive it, and conscionably

bly adhere and conform to it; and besides complying with it, do not upon occasion strive to profess and maintain it in its Purity; but on the contrary carelessly neglect, disingenuously slight, or unworthily pervert and corrupt it: *these* shall certainly sink into Perdition at last. The infallible Word condemns them to no less Punishment. For *unto them that are contentious* (or to (b) those made up of Contention, as disputatious Hereticks, or Schismatics are,) *and do not obey the Truth* (when they are acquainted with, and live under it) *there shall be Indignation and Wrath*, Rom. 2. 8. And *they all shall be damned who believed not the Truth*, 2 Thess. 2. 12. Slighting therefore, rejecting, or opposing Divine Truths, had need be very carefully avoided, when the Crime will be of so dreadful Consequence.

Not that all whose Unhappiness it is to be *unacquainted* with those precious Truths, shall for *that* be consign'd to endless Miseries. *That* would be to punish poor Creatures for *one* great Calamity they could not help, with *another* most intolerable: a Method which every good Man hates, and then how much more must GOD abhor it? The Persons therefore so terribly threatned here, can't be those who never

(b) Τὸς ἐξ ἐχθρίας.

4 *An Antidote against Arianism.*

heard of the Truths of Heaven ; but such as *know* those inestimable Truths, and are well *acquainted* with them : yet at the same time they never *mind*, or little *regard* them ; but rather basely *despise*, or boldly *repulse* them, tho' they are not only publicly recommended, but even frequently and earnestly inculcated. These, these are they who for their lewd Contempt shall fall under the Dint of everlasting Ruin. And no wonder such Unbelievers should be excluded Heaven, when our LORD upon Earth pronounc'd so positively concerning them ; *he that believeth not, is condemned already*, S. *Joh.* 3. 18. And most justly, as refusing and rejecting that true Faith, which is so special a Condition, and so powerful an Instrument of Salvation. But as for forc'd involuntary *Strangers* to the Christian *Doctrine*, they shall never perish for not embracing the Christian *Faith* ; nor is Perdition threatn'd to *them* upon that account.

So we may gather from *Rom.* 3. 19. *What things soever the Law saith, it saith to them that are under the Law.* And the same Rule reaches to the Gospel. Whatsoever things *that* says, it speaks to them that are under its Doctrine or Dispensation. In proportion to which measures, he that drew up this System or Summary of the Christian Faith (whether it were *Athanasius* or no) maybe
sup-

supposed to direct it chiefly to Professors of Christianity, and the actual Profelytes of our LORD JESUS. And so whatever is menac'd by it, must be levell'd at, and terminate *in such*. Who are greatly concern'd, as true Professors of the *Christian* Faith, to stick to that Faith in all Points, and never to corrupt, or prevaricate from it in the least. Not that *Faith alone*, tho' never so perfect, can *justify and save us* neither. For tho' Faith may do many and great things, yet ordinarily *that alone* does not justify. I say, *ordinarily*; for what it may do in an *extraordinary* case, is of another consideration. For instance, some may happen to die as soon as they are converted; and then being actually turned from Sin to GOD, they must be in a State of Salvation, tho' Death striking in so soon or suddenly upon them, they could have *no time* for *Good Works*: and so *Faith alone must justify and save* such. And for this very good *Reason*, because they lived but an Instant after Conversion, and in that Moment Good Works were impracticable, for want of space wherein to do them; the Persons being hurried hence so hastily. But to affirm we are *commonly* and *constantly* so justify'd, would be a great Fault; as flatly contradicting the HOLY GHOST, who declares it to be otherwise, *S. Jam. 2. 24. by works a Man is justified, and not by Faith only.*

6 *An Antidote against Arianism.*

And to clear up to satisfaction what he thus plainly and positively asserts; the Apostle takes more than usual pains. For disputing against the *Antinomian* Error, which he might then perceive was budding, or beginning to spring up amongst Christians; he alledges *six Divine Arguments* drawn up by Inspiration to confute it, and to evince that we are *not Justify'd by Faith* alone. We find them all in the 2d Chapter of his Epistle.

The *First*, to this Sense. That Faith which does not Profit nor Save, cannot Justify: but Faith alone does neither. What doth it profit, though a Man say he hath Faith and have no Works? can Faith save him? verse 14.

The *Second*. That Faith which is dead cannot Justify: but Faith alone, or without Works, is dead; even as dead as that *Charity*, which relieves the Poor with good Words and Wishes only. If a Brother or Sister be naked, and destitute of daily Food; and one of you say unto them, depart in peace, be ye warmed and filled: notwithstanding ye give them not those things which are needful to the Body; what doth it profit? Even so Faith without Works is dead, v. 15, 16, 17.

The *Third*. That Faith which can't evince it self, is not like to justify us. But Faith alone is always inevident, as being demonstrable only by Works. A Man may say, thou

thou hast Faith, and I have Works; Shew me thy Faith without Works, and I will shew thee my Faith by my Works, v. 18.

The *Fourth*. That Faith which dwells in Devils, can't justify any Man. But bare Faith is compatible to Devils (and that in a prime Article of Religion, *awful Belief of the DEITY.*) *Thou believest there is one GOD, thou doest well; the Devils also believe and tremble, v. 19.*

The *Fifth*. That Faith which does not Justify others, can't Justify us. But naked Faith Justifies *no others* either Men or Women. For Men, the Patriarch most famous for Faith is made the *Instance*; for he was not Justify'd by Believing in GOD only, but by Offering up his Son. *Was not Abraham Justify'd by Works, when he offered Isaac upon the Altar? v. 21.* Which makes the thing so manifest, that not discerning it when 'tis so exemplify'd, would speak us careless Observers of a very weighty and important Truth. And therefore the Apostle prefac'd the Argument with *this Question*. *Wilt thou know, O vain Man! that Faith without Works is dead?* Insinuating, that he who apprehends not this plain and momentous Doctrine; must needs be an empty and inconsiderate Person in Heaven's account.

And then for the *other Sex*, he brings in *Rahab*, declaring Her not to be Justify'd by Believing neither; but by *entertaining*, and

dismissing the Spies so Charitably. Was not Rahab the Harlot Justify'd by Works, when she had received the Messengers, and had sent them out another way? v. 25.

The *Last Argument*. That Faith which is *Imperfect* cannot Justify. For being defective in its *Measures*, it must miss or come short of its *End*. But then Faith deficient in it self, is to be back'd and assisted by *good Works*. And so the *End* for which it was design'd will be effectually accomplish'd. By *Works Faith is made Perfect*, v. 22.

From all which nervous argumentative Premisses, he rightly draws this firm Conclusion. That *solitary Faith, or Faith without Works is dead*. Even as dead as an humane Body can be *without a Soul*. And so (as *Solidians* may note) it can do no more towards Justification, than such a Body can do of the Functions of Life, when destitute of a Soul. *As the Body without the Spirit is dead; so Faith without Works is dead also*, v. 26.

As sure therefore as St. James's Doctrine thus divinely prov'd is true; so certainly must *Justification by Faith only be a meer Figure*. And we may greatly wonder that *that Perswasion* should ever prevail as it has done; when it plainly contradicts the Canon of Scripture (pronouncing as before) *by Works a Man is Justify'd, and not by Faith only*. Let Christians then *be strong in Faith*,

as the Apostle advises; but withal *careful to maintain good Works*. Indeed our Church affirms, in her *Eleventh Article*, that *our being Justify'd by Faith only, is a most wholsom Doctrine*. Which some laying hold of as an handle for *Antinomianism*, make too much use of that way. But by it she means only *that we are not accounted Righteous before GOD, for our own Works or Deservings*: as that *Article* expresses it. And to make this appear, she there refers us to the *Homily of Justification*, which treats of that matter more largely. And in that *Homily*, intitl'd, *A Sermon of the Salvation of Mankind &c;* against these Words in the *Margent*, *Faith alone, how it is to be understood*: we find this Paragraph explicative of it in the Body of the Discourse. *This Saying, that we be Justify'd by Faith only, freely, and without Works, is spoken for to take away clearly all Merit of our Works, as being unable to deserve our Justification at GOD's hands*. So that give her but leave to explain her own Words (who best knows their meaning) and she's so far from favouring the *Antinomian* extravagancy; that she only fights against the *Romanists*. For in just Honour to GOD's *Free Grace*, and duly to magnify our REDEEMER's *Sufferings*; in the matter of *Justification* she only excludes the *Merit of good Works*, not their *Concomitancy*. And why may they not so far share with

10 *An Antidote against Arianism.*

with Faith in Justifying us, as GOD requires them as a Condition to qualify us for acceptance in the blood of CHRIST? And let me add, What reason have we to shut Good Works out of Justification, when Faith it self (which some make the sole Instrument of it) is a Good Work? For it being an Act, or Operation of the Mind, it can be no less than a Mental, or Spiritual Good Work. And how can Justification which is a Spiritual Work be done more properly than by a Spiritual Energy and Efficiency? And so they that allow not Good Works do help to Justify, put a kind of fallacy upon themselves by holding we are Justify'd by Faith alone; when that's a Good Work, and one of the chiefest we can do. And here again I have our Church on my side, as she affirms, there is one Good Work, in which be all Good Works, that is Faith. Book of Hom. Sermon. Of Good Works. Part 1st.

A R-

ARTICLE II.

And the Catholick Faith is this :
that we worship one GOD in TRI-
NITY, and TRINITY in UNITY;

Neither confounding the PER-
SONS: nor dividing the Substance.

EXPOSITION.

And then as to the *Prime and Main Article* of that Holy Faith, which sound Christians are oblig'd to profess; (in short) it runs thus. They must believe, that the GOD they worship is a Being so peculiarly Glorious (as 'tis fit he should) as to be ever THREE without Confusion; and always ONE without Division. And so as many as would conceive rightly of his MAJESTY, must think He consists of *Three* that are *Distinct*, in *One* that is a perfect *Unit*. This being the True and Genuine, it must be our settled Notion of Him. And therefore at present I must think and say; that to call the Divine PERSONS *Consubstantial*, and *Coeffential*, as if those very LIVES were real *Substances*, and the same with the Divine *Essence*; would be utterly *destructive* to a TRINITY in UNITY. For supposing them all to be *Substance*, what
coul

could They be but *Spirit* ? And then three distinct PERSONS, being three distinct SPIRITS ; what would they be less than *three distinct GODS* ? For how can *three* distinct Spirits be but *one* at the same time ? Yet in a *proper* and *due* Sense, the Sacred PERSONS may be both *Consubstantial*, and *Coeffential* still. *Consubstantial*, as they are together in the *Substance* of the Infinite Spirit : and *Coeffential*, as that Spirit is the *Common Essence* to them all, wherein They are united.

Should any interrogate, What, do you make the Glorious PERSONS *nothing but meer LIVES* then ? I must answer, No. For they are not, they cannot be PERSONS as LIVES only ; but as they are three infinite LIVES in that infinite Spirit, which is the *Substance*, or *Essence* of the GOD-HEAD. And as They are *in* that Substance, and united *to* it ; so as They are distinct PERSONS, They may be joined to that Essence in *different ways* suitable to their respective Diversities. Tho' what those various *Ways*, or *Modes* of Union are, if we cannot discover upon Earth, we need not wonder at it, when we know not *how* our *own Lives* are in our Souls, nor yet *how* our Souls are join'd to our Bodies.

But tho' the LIVES in the GOD-HEAD be three Distinct PERSONS, as variously joined to the Essence ; yet they must not have
three

three Distinct Minds, Wills, and Memories. For they have but one Essence; and that being the common Root from which they all spring, and the common Centre where they all meet, and the common Substance which they all actuate: Their Mental, Spontaneous, and Memorial Powers, &c. must all be common too. The Unity in Essence that makes the Trinity of PERSONS One GOD; must needs make them One as much in the aforefaid Capacities. Here therefore the Schools hit right; voluntas essentiae divinae est una numero, quia una numero est essentia.

And that the Doctrine of the TRINITY was of old well known to the *World of Spirits*; the Oracle of *Serapis* near *Alexandria*, seems to attest. For as *Snidas* relates, when *Thules* the *Egyptian* Monarch consulted that Oracle, enquiring concerning the King, and GOD greater than he: it gave him this Answer, Πρῶτα Θεός, μετέπειτα Λόγος, ἔπειτα Πνεῦμα σὺν ᾧ ἅπαντα. There is *first GOD, then the LOGOS, and with them the SPIRIT*. What more agreeable to the Oracles Divine?

ARTICLE III.

For there is one PERSON of the FATHER, another of the SON: and another of the HOLY GHOST.

EXPOSITION.

That in GOD there is a TRINITY is most clear and certain. For in Him there are *three*, as Scripture assures us, and call'd by those very Denominations which this Article gives them. So we find in St. Mat. 28. 19. where the Apostles were commanded to Baptize *in the Name of the FATHER, and of the SON, and of the HOLY GHOST.* And to this we have a parallel Text in 1 St. Joh. 5. 7. *There are Three that bear record in Heaven, the FATHER, the WORD, and the HOLY GHOST.* Where tho' the *Second* in the TRIAD be stil'd the WORD, that makes no difference in the case, nor gives any occasion or umbrage of just Exception. For by the same inspir'd Writer, in the first Chapter of his Gospel, the WORD is not only said to be *the SON of GOD* more than once; but is declar'd to be the *only Begotten of the FATHER*, v. 14. and his *only Begotten SON*, v. 18. So that SON and WORD are but Terms Synonymous, and both mean the same thing. And

And tho' that Verse in *St. John's* is not found in some Copies; yet 'tis in the most *ancient*, and in the *best*, and in all that are *printed* but *one*. Indeed from its being wanting in several Copies, the *Arians* have concluded it supposititious; and where they found it in any, were ready to charge the Orthodox with Fraud and Forgery for inserting it. Whereas they had more cause to suspect, that the Text was expunged by the *Arians*. For so very opposite is it to their rank Heresy, as effectually to subvert it, where the Words of it are receiv'd according to their Truth. But on the other side, the Orthodox can sufficiently maintain the Catholick Doctrine of the TRINITY without them. I mean, from other Passages in the Sacred Writings, where Arguments to that purpose occur plentifully, tho' I cite but few to avoid prolixity.

The *first* shall be that in *Gen. 1. 26. GOD said let us make Man in our Image, after our Likeness.* Where a Name of the plural being join'd with a Verb of the singular number, would be very ill Grammar; did not that Name imply more Persons than one.

Yet the *Hebrews* knew so little *who* they were; that they made US there to signify GOD and his Angels; as if those Spirits had been GOD's Copartners in the Work of Creating

16 *An Antidote against Arianism.*

ating Man. And they tell us, that the *Seventy* were so put to it here, that they were fain to render (c) *let us make*, by *I will make*; lest *Ptolemy*, who imploy'd them, out of their Translation should have pick'd a *Plurality* of GODS. Tho' how very *naturally* the Expression might intimate *several* PERSONS in the DEITY, is obvious to remark.

Which others of *those* Learned not apprehending, have run into this egregious Absurdity. They wildly phansy'd that when GOD made Man, (d) he invited the *Elements* to help in doing it. A very *wrong*, as well as *mean* Thought. For as 'tis plain that GOD alone made *Adam*; so 'tis as manifest that he was made but of *one Element*, that is, *Earth*: For the LORD GOD *formed Man of the Dust of the Ground*, Gen. 2. 7. And how then could the *Elements* contribute to his Composition? and much less *assist* in his *Formation*.

And that the Christians of old inferr'd a TRINITY from the Sacred Text aforesaid; and also from that in Gen. 3. 22. *Behold the Man is become as one of us*: is clear from *Tertullian*, who thus descants upon

(c) בעשה by ποιῶ.

(d) P. Fag. Transla. princíp. Col.

both. (e) If so be the number of the TRINITY offends thee, as if they were not knit together in a single UNITY; I ask how a single one alone speaks plurally; let us make Man in our Image, after our Likeness, when he ought to have said, let me make Man after my Image and Likeness; as being but one and single? And so in the words following; behold the Man is become as one of us; He but deceives or jests, should he speak like a Number when he is but One, and alone, and single: or did he speak to Angels, as the Jews interpret it, for neither do they acknowledge the SON? Or because He was FATHER, SON, and SPIRIT, did he therefore speak plurally to himself, to shew that he was more than one? Yea, because the SON, the Second PERSON, his WORD was united to Him; and the

(e) Si te numerus scandalizat TRINITATIS quasi non connexa in Unitate simplici, interrogo quomodo unicus & singularis pluraliter loquitur; faciamus hominem ad imaginem & similitudinem nostram, cum debuerit dixisse, faciam hominem ad imaginem & similitudinem meam, utpote unicus & singularis? Sed & in sequentibus; ecce Adam factus est tanquam unus ex nobis, fallit aut ludit, ut cum unus, & solus, & singularis esset, numerosè loqueretur: aut nunquid Angelis loquebatur ut *Judei* interpretantur, quia nec ipsi Filium agnoscunt? an quia Ipse erat Pater, Filius, Spiritus, ideo pluralè se præstans, pluraliter sibi loquebatur? Imo quia jam adhærebat illi Filius Secunda Persona Sermo Ipsi; & Tertia, Spiritus in Sermonè, ideo pluraliter pronunciavit, *Paciamus; & Nostram; & Nobis.* Cœn: Præterea.

Third, the SPIRIT in the Word ; therefore be spake plurally ; Let us make, and our Image, and our Likeness, &c. And before him Irenæus declar'd that GOD spake the same Words, to the WORD and WISDOM, to the SON and the SPIRIT. Advers. Hæres. l. 4. cap. 37.

And that there is a Glorious TRINITY appears as evidently from sundry Texts in the *New Testament* ; where those THREE are so distinguish'd, as to be very fairly diversify'd. In full proof of as much I need cite but that *one* in St. *Joh. 14. 16.* (backing it with the mention of *another*) *I will pray the FATHER, and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you for ever, even the SPIRIT of Truth.* Where *I* denotes the SON speaking, as may be gather'd from the 13th verse. And he must be distinct from the FATHER, inasmuch as *Father* and *Son* must needs be *two*, and can't possibly be *one* ; no more than a *Cause* can be its *own Effect*. And then the *Third* here mention'd is the SPIRIT, who must be distinct from the FATHER, as *Proceeding from Him*, chap. 15. 26. and from the SON, as being *sent by Him*, says the same Text: for as no one can proceed from Himself, so no one can send himself neither. I add ; that there is a TRINITY, in the GOD-HEAD we may learn from a Philosopher, as well as from

from the Scripture. For as (a) Justin Martyr testifies of Plato, he assigns the Second Place to the WORD of GOD, and the Third to the SPIRIT said to have moved upon the Waters. Where he expressly owns GOD, the LOGOS or WORD, and the SPIRIT. But as the Father notes there, Plato had this ὑπὸ Μωσέως, from Moses.

But besides that this Article owns there are THREE in the GOD-HEAD, and gives them their proper Titles; it farther declares that they are PERSONS. For it positively asserts, that there is one PERSON of the FATHER, another of the SON: and another of the HOLY GHOST. Now How do they appear to be so? I answer in a word, By their Personal, External Acts. And to evidence their Performance of such Actions, I need but touch upon those they are said to do, in the Words now quoted. I will pray the FATHER, and He shall give you another Comforter, that He may abide with you for ever. I will pray the FATHER; the SON's Resolution, even that SON's, who tells us more than once in the same Chapter, I am in the FATHER, and the FATHER in Me; and charges his Profelytes to believe it. But to pray to GOD, or intercede with

(a) Δευτέραν χώραν τῷ παρὰ ΘΕΟΥ ΛΟΓΩ δίδωσι τὴν δὲ τρίτην τῷ λεχθέντι, ἐπεφύρεται τῷ ὕδατι ΠΝΕΥΜΑΤΙ. Strom. Lib. 5.

Him is an *Act* of an High Nature; and who can do it but a *Person*? As the SON was to *pray* the FATHER, so the FATHER was to *hear and answer Him*. But that's another great and glorious *Work*, and who can do it but a *Person*? The *Gratuity* the SON was to Pray for, and which the FATHER was to answer Him with, was no less than the *SPIRIT of Truth*. Who was to be a COMFORTER, and as *such* was to *abide* with Christians *for ever*. But who can *comfort* others, and numberless Numbers of them, and *be with them* as a perpetual Comforter; but a *Person*? I might instance in abundance of Glorious Acts proving the Divine THREE to be PERSONS: but for brevity's sake, let this one fair *Specimen* of that rich Plenty, satisfy.

Yet this must be remarkt. That all the Glorious Three have not only exerted themselves respectively in *such Acts*, as prove them so many distinct PERSONS to our *Judgments* or *Apprehensions*: but moreover were pleased in wonderful Condescension to shew themselves *once*, more *plainly*, and *familiarly*; even in ways *obvious* to Mens very *Senses*. It was done upon the high and solemn Occasion of our Blessed LORD's publick Inauguration into his *Prophetick* Office. For then the FATHER spake by an *audible voice* from Heaven: *Thou art my beloved SON, in thee I am well pleased*. That beloved SON

was

was openly Baptiz'd, in the River Jordan. And when he went up out of the Water, the HOLY GHOST descending in a Bodily Shape like a Dove, lighted visibly upon him. A plain Manifestation of their respective PERSONS even by *sensible Acts*. And how could Spiritual and Divine PERSONS be more evidently exhibited? And their Acts being not only many and various, but most wonderful, as might easily be made out; *Persons*, is not only a *very fit*, but the *most proper Title* for Them. The learned and ancient Writer therefore that call'd the DEITY, (f) a *Tripersonal Unity*, spake a most agreeable Truth, in terms authentick. Especially when by the FATHER's *Begetting* the SON, and by His, and the SON's *Breathing* the HOLY GHOST; They are Three PERSONS, as really distinct by *internal* or *immanent Acts*; as they are, or can be by *extrinsick* ones. Tho' that they are PERSONS far *different* from *ours*, must be granted. For whereas three Persons of ours, are *three separate perfect Men*; the Three PERSONS above are but *one GOD*. And accordingly it follows :

(f) Ἐνὰ δὲ τρισυπόστατον.

ARTICLE IV.

But the GODHEAD of the FATHER, of the SON, and of the HOLY GHOST, is all *one*: the Glory Equal, the Majesty Co-eternal.

EXPOSITION.

And no wonder it should be so; for the PERSONS being all in the same Essence, tho' they are *Three*, the GODHEAD can be but *One*. And the reason is, because in the Spiritual *Substance* or *Essence* of GOD, there is no such *Propagative Power*; as its *Vital Principle* has, from which the PERSONS Rose. And therefore tho' the PERSONALITIES were eternally multiply'd; yet still *Essentially* GOD remains but a Simple Unit. Whereas had the Essence been eternally Multiply'd together with the PERSONS; the inevitable Consequence of that Multiplication must have been *Tritheism*, or Three GODS.

But then the Blessed PERSONS having all but one Essence, and every one sharing alike in it, as they do thereby enliven it: how can they be otherwise than *Coequal* as to *Essential* Glory, and *Coeternal* in *Essential* MAJESTY? Nor will this *Essential* Equality

lity of those Three, at all interfere with their *Personal Subordination*; there is no cause or occasion for it. For *that* results not from the *Essence*, but wholly and naturally from *Personal Acts*. So the SON is subordinate to the FATHER, not as being in the *Essence*, but as *Begotten* by him; and the HOLY GHOST is subordinate to Both, not because he is in the *Essence*, but as being from Both equally *Breathed*. For even where PERSONS are infinite, yet if one derives Subsistence from another there's sufficient Ground for *Orderly Priority* and *Subordination*. Yet that in the Sacred TRIAD Two of the PERSONS are so *Derivative*, is plain from Scripture; which clearly informs, that the SON is by *Generation*; and the HOLY GHOST by *Procession*. And what Scripture owns and asserts of this Nature, the FATHER illustrates by a treble *Simile*. For says he, (g) *the SPIRIT is the Third from GOD and the SON, as the Fruit is the Third from the Root, of the Stem; and as a River is the Third from the Fountain, by the Stream; and as the Tip of a Ray is the Third from the Sun, of a Beam.*

This Article therefore of the Creed, seems to be warily worded, and nicely tempered,

(g) Tertius enim est Spiritus a Deo & Filio, sicut tertius a radice fructus ex frutice; & tertius a fonte, rivus ex Flumine; & tertius a Sole, apex ex radio. *Tertul. Cont. Prax.*

24 *An Antidote against Arianism.*

to shew the *Order* amongst the PERSONS in the GODHEAD; and to point out their Essential Parity. And as Both these certainly *are*, so they as fairly *appear to be* in a VITAL TRINITY. For the *Second* LIFE rising from the *First*, and the *Third* from them Two; by this its Constitution the PERSONS in it, which are these LIVES, must be duly *Subordinate*; and then they being all alike in the *Essence*, their Glory and MAJESTY must be *equal*, both in Degree, and in Duration, in reference to that Essence.

And here let me note, that tho' *Substance* and *Essence* in relation to the TRINITY, are common *School Terms*; yet touching the DEITY they were used long before, and with very good and great *reason*. For GGD's Name that He assum'd to Himself, and whereby he was first made known to his People, was, *I am that I am*, Exod. 3. 14. Which imports BEING; even *Necessary, Eternal, Independent* BEING; and then how very proper and agreeable, must *Substance* and *Essence* be unto His MAJESTY? Especially when the PERSON of the FATHER is said to be Υἱόστασις, *a Subsistence*, Heb. 1. 3. And accordingly Numenius affirms the *Proper Name of the Incorporeal Being* to be ὁσιαν, ἢ οὐ, SUBSTANCE, and ESSENCE, Euseb. Præp. Ev. 11. 10.

ARTICLE V.

Such as the FATHER is, such is the SON : and such is the HOLY GHOST.

EXPOSITION.

We are farther to believe that the Three DIVINE PERSONS are all *Similar*, or of the like Nature, So that look what the FATHER is, and the same are the SON, and HOLY-GHOST ; however They differ in *Name*, or *Relation*, or *Order*.

And here several *Questions* may be ask'd, to which proper Answers will be necessary.

The *First* this. Since the DIVINE PERSONS are so alike, *What may we take them all to be ?* The Question being of weight and great importance, I answer it plainly and directly thus. *In all probability they are, and must be Divine LIVES.* And for this very good Reason, because *they are own'd to be so in the Sacred Book.* I shall here insert one pregnant Proof of it equivalent to many. It occurs in 1 S. *Joh.* 1. In the beginning of the Chapter (where he describes the SON of GOD) he tells us in the 1st ver, that He is *the WORD of LIFE.* Meaning
the

26 *An Antidote against Arianism.*

the same WORD which in the first Chapter of his Gospel, he says, *was GOD*, v. 1st; and *was made Flesh*, v. 14th. And in the 2d v. of the Epistle mention'd, he declares that (b) the LIFE (the very LIFE afore-said) *was manifested*: that is, by being *made Flesh*, as he affirm'd before in his Gospel. But then if the WORD was GOD, and the WORD was LIFE, and the WORD was made *Flesh*, and the LIFE was manifested in it: is it not very plain that the SON Who was that WORD, and the Second PERSON in the TRIAD Who was incarnate, must be LIFE? Else how could THE LIFE be manifested by the WORD's, or by GOD's being *made Flesh*?

And then at the 2d verse of S. John's Epistle cited, he tells us of *that Eternal LIFE which was with the FATHER, and was manifested unto us*. Now let any one speak, what *Eternal LIFE* ever was with the FATHER, and then *manifested to us in Flesh*, but CHRIST? But then He must be LIFE.

Yet, which is more, and to our purpose more considerable; the same Divine Writer, in the 1st verse of his same Epistle, assures us, that *the WORD of LIFE* there mention'd (the same with that *Eternal LIFE*, v. 2d) *was that which we* (or such as we) *have*

(b) H 5th.

heard,

heard, which we have seen with our Eyes, which we have looked upon, and our Hands have handled. Here therefore again I challenge *any*, I challenge *all* to speak; what **WORD** of **LIFE**? or what **Eternal LIFE**? could thus be expos'd to three humane *Senses* at once, save the **PERSON** of **CHRIST**? For he was *audible* in Voice, *visible* in Shape, and also *tangible* in Substance as well as other Men, both living and dead. Granting him therefore to be in his **DIVINITY** the *Second* **VITALITY** of the **TRIAD**, and his humane Nature to be personally united to it: and how properly would he be the **WORD** of **LIFE**, and that **ETERNAL LIFE MANIFESTED**? And so *Manifested*, as to be *heard, seen, and handled* by his Apostles? Which no other *Eternal LIFE* could be.

To caution any against surmising, that by the *Eternal LIFE* there spoken of, *that Life* might be meant which **GOD** promis'd, and **CHRIST** purchas'd, and we labour for, and hope to attain: would be most vain and needless. For how could that Life be *heard* to speak, or be *seen* with Eyes, or be *felt* with Hands here upon Earth, when 'tis only to be found and enjoy'd in Heaven? And that the **SON** was an **Eternal VITALITY**, or **LIFE** with the **FATHER** *in respect of his DIVINITY only*, is very evident; because his *Humane Nature* was not *Eternal*; and so
could

could not be eternally with the FATHER, as the Apostle hints the other to have been. And truly in regard of *the latter* He could no more be an *Eternal LIFE*, than one of our selves; His Humanity being the same with ours, only more pure: and so His Being in that respect must commence in *Time*.

And then that the *HOLY GHOST* is a *LIFE* too, is as manifest from his being so call'd in (a) Scripture. And therefore our Church agreeably in the *Nicene Symbol* styles Him, *the LORD and Giver of LIFE*. And He that has All *LIFE* in Himself, and can dispense it at any rate to such as want and seek it; must needs be an inexhaustible Source of *LIFE*, not to say, the very *Element* of it.

But then if the *SON* the *Second PERSON*; and the *HOLY GHOST* the *Third*; be such *LIFES*: the *FATHER* can't be inferiour to Them, as being the *First*, and Fountain of Them Both. Nor can He be different from them in the Quality of his Nature; but must be *LIFE* as well as They, and as *Eternal* as either of them when they issu'd from Himself.

A *Second Question* as proper and needful as the *First*, will be this. The Three *PERSONS* in the *DEITY* being *LIFES*, *What*

(a) See my Essay, Part 1st. p. 21,

may that *LIFE* be which is in *GOD*? I answer; So far as I can humbly conceive, It is the chief Perfection *GOD* has; or the highest, noblest, and most essential Principle in his Being. And from it perhaps all other his Active Powers spring and flow.

Yet I do not say, that *LIFE* is his *Essence* neither, for that's an (a) *Infinite SPIRIT*.

But

(a) So we are taught in a few words, *S. Joh. 4. 24.* *GOD* is a Spirit; A pure Spirit abstracted from all Matter. And so the most eminent both of Greek and Latin Philosophers did account him. *Plato* pronounc'd him a Mind distinct from all Matter. And *Tully* proclaim'd him a Mind free and separate from all mortal Concretion. And indeed pure He is, not only from the contagion of Sin, but from all corporeal Mixture, or material Composition; which perhaps is more than can be said of most, but for certain than can be true of many created Spirits, they being vitally join'd with Matter.

Yet he is not so absolutely Pure neither, as to have nothing in him but his meer simple *Essence*, for the contrary is evident from his Decrees: which tho' they are in him as immanent Acts, they are not of his *Essence*. For had he pass'd no Decrees, he would have been nevertheless; and his *Essence* would have been the same it is.

Besides, *GOD* is a Being absolutely necessary; but his Decrees are not so. For they issu'd from his Will, and so far do depend upon it. And therefore they can't be Himself, because unless he had pleas'd, they could never have been; which is not to be said of his *Essence*, for that exists naturally, and so necessarily.

Nor can these Decrees be his Will, and so himself; for they are but emanative from it, and arbitrary Dispositions and Determinations of it; and so very different from his *Essence*. Tho' when I call *GOD's* Decrees Arbitrary Determinations, I mean, they were so only before they were fixt; for after that they became immutable.

Clearing up of this, that all in *GOD* is not his *Essence*; needs not be thought frivolous and useless. For how slight and trivial soever it may seem, in some Cases it will be of great Weight;

30 *An Antidote against Arianism.*

But because LIFE quickens and actuates it, and without it it would be but a *dead Substance*: LIFE is so absolutely necessary for GOD, that I call it an *Essential Principle* in Him. And by reason this LIFE is Infinite, and illivens an Infinite SPIRIT; all Active Properties and Powers in the GODHEAD, as *Understanding, Will, Memory, Goodness, Mercy, Truth, Knowledge, Wisdom, Justice, Might, &c.* are *Infinite* too: and the *Exercise* of them all depends upon his LIFE,

Weight; particularly in the Article of Predestination. For there presuming the Decrees of GOD to be his Essence, runs Men upon hideous and unhappy Doctrines, and rivets them close and fast to the same. In the train of which, amongst other lamentable Inconveniences, this is one. It is a mighty Prejudice to the Protestant Religion in Foreign Countries. For while we censure Romanists for want of Charity, because they condemn all as Hereticks, and sentence them to Perdition that are out of their Communion: they truly retort upon many of us, that we make GOD as severe, and worse to the far greater part of Mankind. For we teach, that from his meer Will, and for his own Pleasure, he has sentenc'd them to endless Misery in the State of intolerable Torments.

But the Essence of GOD being Infinite Spirit; I cannot but drop this useful Note here; that His MAJESTY must by no means be represented in Pictures or Images. The reason is obvious; He cannot be so truly, and therefore he may not be so Lawfully. A great fault in the Church of Rome. And tho' Bellarmine defends it as well as he can, yet one of the Popes was utterly against it, for the reason hinted; because it was not a secible thing. Baronius in his Annals, at the Year 726. has recorded it, that Gregory the 2d, to the Question, Cur tamen, &c. Why do we not subject the FATHER of our LORD JESUS to our Eyes? replied thus, Quoniam, &c. Because the Nature of GOD can't be expos'd to our view. And so the learned Philo thought, τοῦ ἀσφατοῦ, &c. To paint or form the Image of the invisible GOD, is prophane.

with-

without which none of them could *be in*, much less *exerted by* Him.

They who from *Reason* can't argue and conclude that *LIFE* is so potent in the *DEITY*; *Experience*, if they attend to it, may somewhat illighten, and help to convince them that so it may be. For we see in *others*, and we feel in *our selves*, that *LIFE* is *that* which sustains our Beings, and supports even all our Natural Functions; as well as it does *us* in our various Employments. And when experimentally we find Life so strong and active in *our selves*, and that it upholds our Nature, Faculties, and Abilities: we may from thence the better conclude what it does in the BLESSED GOD. But then we must suppose it done in ways suitable to Himself; or in measures infinitely higher than ours, as being answerable to his infinite Nature. For *Life in Him*, being infinitely above what is in *us*, or in any Creatures; ours must by no means vie with his in Operations? What is ours but a created Life, and so factitious, narrow, and precarious? and how then should it act like that in GOD, which is absolute and boundless, and as Eternal as 'tis Independent?

Yet still a good way to illustrate *His* Life, and to set its Excellency in the clearer Light; may be to *compare* it with *other* Lives. For albeit Life is the most noble thing in Living Creatures, yet between the Lives of their
fundry

sundry Species there is great Disparity. Thus what vast difference is there between the Life of a *Mite*, and that of a *Man*? And between the Life of a *Man*, and that of an *Angel*? But then between the Life of an *Angel*, and that of *GOD*, there is no comparison: because *GOD*'s *LIFE* shines forth most gloriously, in that it appears so superlatively excellent as to be *Incomparable*. And the reason of that its peerless transcendency, in a word, is this: It is *Infinite*, and *Innitely Perfect*. And here I appeal to the whole *Christian World*, and let them Judge if these infinitely Perfect *LIFES*, as the one is *Self-subsistent*, the other *Begotten*, and the third *Proceeding*; and all in the *Divine ESSENCE*: be not infinitely more fit to constitute the *TRINITY*, than those silly *Trifles*, *Modes*, and *Relations*; or any thing else that can be thought of. That the *DIVINE PERSONS* ought to consist of the most Excellent and Glorious Principle that ever was, or can be; is so very reasonable: that all the *Judicious* must grant it at once. And let the same please to say, what is more Excellent, or can be more Glorious than *LIFE* infinitely Perfect; and so more fit to constitute the *HOLY TRIAD*. And in one respect I must needs say, that this *LIFE* seems to excell all *other* things, and to be *alone* capable of doing that great Work; I mean in its being most naturally *Propagative*

of it self. So that, and that only, is most exactly futed to raise the Glorious Constitution of the GOD HEAD; and so it has done from all Eternity, by making it THREE in ONE, in all likelihood. And to this we may the more readily assent, as being very agreeable to our own Constitution. For every Man is three ways illiven'd, and actually injoys three different *Lives*. A *Rational* Life, whereby he's able to think and discourse. A *Sensitive* Life, whereby he perceives Pleasure and Pain. And a *Vegetative* Life, whereby he's capable of Nutrition and Growth. And when three such curious Lives are complicated in *us*; we need not wonder that three infinitely Glorious Ones Concenter in GOD. Tho' so graceful a resemblance of his Majesty, must be one of the truest and brightest Honours that can adorn us.

Should any object, that they know not whether *such* LIVES in the Divine ESSENCE, can Be the PERSONS of the Sacred TRINITY: I might answer them with this Question. *How do they know, and how dare they say, that These LIVES cannot do that?* Who can tell what infinite Perfections infinitely perfect LIVES contain? and what infinitely Great and Glorious things they can be, and do, when I have elsewhere made it plain, that LIFE is such a Power or Principle, that even the Great GOD Himself cannot do the least Act without it? For where

D

indeed

indeed can we discover any thing, that has native moving Force, or an inbred active Energy in it, but LIFE? And in case the Objectors doubt of those LIVES *Abilities* to do this HIGHEST Work that ever was done, *Raising of the TRINITY*: let them think till they can find what will do it *better*, and then impart it kindly to the World. In the mean time, to the HOLY THREE Whom I adore as ONE, I most humbly profess; that to believe them rais'd by such sorry things as *Modes* and *Relations*, I do in their Glorious Names and Presence utterly detest, and shall eternally abhor. The Reason of this Abhorrence will partly appear in the Answer to the next Question: which runs thus.

Is not a LIFE the very same with a Mode in the TRINITY? I answer, *No, by no means.* They differ much, and the Difference between them is so great and obvious; that where it is not understood, there must be a fault or defect in the Understanding. And because *Modes* have been of so high Esteem, as to be reckon'd the DIVINE THREE; I shall briefly shew how very short they are of those LIVES, which seem to be the *real* PERSONS; and how egregiously they must err, who can once think that *Modes* should be what the DIVINEST LIVES are. For

1st. *They*

1st. *They are not at all countenanc'd in Scripture.* Indeed it gives Grounds, and very good ones, for calling every one of the Blessed Three a LIFE. But for terming any one of them a *Mode*, is so far from being common there, that the Word never occurs. And no wonder, when to make those Glorious PERSONS *Modes*, would not only be inconsistent with Reason, but directly contrary even to common Sense, which can never yield so meer a Trifle should be GOD as a *Mode* is; which yet it must be, if it is a Divine PERSON.

2dly. In case a LIFE in the TRINITY be a *Mode*, a *Mode* must Create, and also Redeem, and likewise Sanctify us; those great Works being done for us by the Glorious Three. And then what infinite Power and infinite Merit must *Modes* have in themselves? and what excellent Graces must they dispense to Men? And so *Modes* for certain must be admirable things. But alas! instead of that, what can be more empty and despicable? and than DIVINE LIVES, if *Modes*, must be the same. And can any CHRISTIANS, or dare any venture to assert that? That the THREE in the GOD-HEAD are so contemptible?

Yet which is somewhat oversetting to think; the most famous for Learning in their time, have openly taught, and stiffly maintain'd this hideous Doctrine. Tho' I can't

but observe, that in so doing those Writers were miserably inconsistent *with*, and unlucky *to* themselves. For the *School Doctors*, who made *Modes* to be PERSONS in the TRINITY, at the same time laid it down as a *Maxim*, or standing Rule, (i) It manifestly appears that in GOD there cannot be an Accident. And yet they affirm those PERSONS to be *Modes*, and what are they better than *Accidents*, if indeed they be so good? And thus while they pretend to explain *Mysteries*, and establish *Fundamental Truths*; they shamefully disparage the Glorious GOD, and contradict themselves.

The Censure, I own, runs high, and falls heavy, but they pull it down upon themselves: for they expressly teach thus, (k) *These three Relations, Paternity, Filiation, and Procession, are called Personal Properties, as constituting PERSONS. For Paternity is the PERSON of the FATHER, Filiation is the PERSON of the SON, Procession of the HOLY GHOST Proceeding. Where besides the bold Step of making Personal Properties to be PERSONS themselves; what are those Properties (but as here called) Relations? And*

(i) Manifestè apparet quod in DEO Accidens esse non potest. *Aquin. Sum. Theol. 1a, qu. 3. 6. c.*

(k) Hæ tres Relationes, paternitas, filiatio, processio, dicuntur proprietates personales, quasi Personas constituentes. Nam paternitas est Persona Patris, filiatio est Persona Filii, processio Persona Spiritus, &c. *Id. ib. 1a. qu. 38. 2. 2m.*

what are *Relations* but *Respects*? And what are *Respects* but *Accidents* at best? And so when Men and Angels, as their Duty is, worship the PERSONS in the GOD-HEAD, they must worship *Accidents*: and would not they be goodly Objects of Divine Adoration? For the Learned to mistake so very grossly in *any case*, would have been unhappy; but to do it *here* must be wofully wretched and deplorable. For what common Christians methinks of sound Understanding, could ever have thought the Glorious PERSONS in the DEITY, such paultry things?

Yet which is worse, *Modes* (which they'll have to be Divine PERSONS) are even *meaner* than *Accidents*. For as *they* inform us who are *most vers'd in Metaphysical Niceties*, they are but (1) *Middlings*, (as I may say) *Negative Middlings*, *between Accidents and Nothing*. And so impossible it is that they should ever have suppos'd the DIVINE PERSONS constituted of more inconsiderable Trifles. And therefore when I blam'd the School Divines for conceiving They were *Accidents* it seems I was too favourable; for they are more *culpable* still in making them *Relations*. Because so they sink them *lower* yet, making them *less* and *worse* than *Accidents*; even bare *Habitudes*, or meer exter-

(1) Media interjecta inter Accidens & nihil.

nal *Denominations*. And that *Relations* must be inferior to *Accidents*, we learn from the Skillful in Scholastick Subtilties. For according to *them* tho' *Accidents* may be in *Subjects*, *Relations* cannot, as being but *ascrib'd*, or *imputed* to them. So a Philosophy Professor (no Novice in the umbratil Learning of the Schools) assures us. His words are these, (m) *But indeed Relations consist wholly in respect and in order to something else, nor do they contain any thing in themselves besides what refers to their proper Term. And it is foolishly and falsely said, that Relations are in Subjects like other Accidents; when to a Subject they are only attributed.*

And if *Relations* be so light and airy things that they can never be in *Persons*; how can they possibly be *Persons themselves*? and much less raise Divine *Ones* in the GOD-HEAD? Let any that are Masters but of one Spark of clear Reason Judge how they can do it. Yet see the unhappiness of the Learned here. For even a famous Prelate of our Church in *vindicating* the Doctrine of the TRINITY, was forc'd (for want of a better *Hypothesis*) into the Wild Measures of the Schools; and

(m) At Relationes totæ consistunt in respectu & in ordine ad aliud, nec quicquam aliud involvunt in essentia sua præter respectum ad terminum. Quare inepte dicitur ac falso Relationes more Accidentium cæterorum inesse Subjectis, cum Subjecto tantummodo attribuantur. Adu. Hereb. Disput. ex Philos. Select. 5. Thes. 3.

was fain to make use of their trashy Notions, *Modes*, and *Relations*. For he positively declares that (n) *the difference of the Hypostases must be from the Difference of Relations, and manner of Subsistence.*

But there being three LIVES in the DEITY, some may put a *Fourth* Question. *How, or whence did they come?* To which I answer thus. The Glorious LIFE of GOD, as it is now, and ever will be, so it *always* was. For it existed from Eternity, nor could it do otherwise, to do that being its *natural Perfection*. And as Created Life is every where *prolifick*, or *procreative* of it self in this our World: so Divine Uncreated LIFE in the GODHEAD, as it abounds with all agreeable Excellencies, so with this amongst others; that it naturally *propagates it self*, and from Eternity yields three infinite VITALITIES, or adorable PERSONS there; the *First* of which *begat* the *Second*, and the *Third* was *Breath'd* by *Them Two*.

Not that Propagation is here to be taken in a *literal* and gross, but in an *allusive* and illustrative Sense, intimating this much. That as natural Propagation is absolutely necessary to keep up the various Species of Beings on Earth, which otherwise would soon finally perish; so the Acts of Divine Genera-

(n) *Bishop Stillingfleet in his Vindication of the Doctrine of the TRINITY, Chap. 6.*

tion, and Spiration, in the GOD-HEAD (too sublime to be now understood) and which for want of a Better Word, I call *Propagative*: serve to an *End* as *lofty* as those *Acts* themselves. For perhaps by their constant Energy, the Subsistence of the Blessed VITALITIES is perpetually supported. And the uninterrupted Continuation of those stupendious Acts, may probably be as needful to sustain the infinite VITALITIES there; as Physical Procreation is to uphold the several Kinds of Animals here below, by successive Multiplication of their respective Individuals. I say, *probably*, or *perhaps* it is thus; I speak it not positively, but conjecturally rather, or hypothetically, leaving here a Latitude for farther Speculation. For as we find, *S. John 5. 26. As the FATHER hath Life in Himself, so hath He given to the SON to have LIFE in Himself.* Which may import, that *the SON lives of Himself* (tho *not from Himself*, as the FATHER does.) And possibly without depending on incessant generative Communication of LIFE. Yet because whether he does so or not is doubtful, and a great Question; at present I dismiss it undetermin'd. Tho indeed I rather think that the SON subsists of Himself, as a LIFE generated by His FATHER: and that the HOLY GHOST deriv'd from Both, does the same in His Capacity.

And

And that there are Three LIVES in the DEITY, may be fairly inferr'd from the Threefold LIFE in our selves. For the ALMIGHTY THREE consulting, as it were, about Man's Creation, prefac'd the doing of it thus: *Let us make Man after our Likeness*, Gen. 1. 26. Now this being agreed to, and Man accordingly having a *Triple* LIFE in him; and being made after GOD's *Likeness*: tho' GOD is but *One*, He must needs have *Three LIVES* in *his Being* too, tho' as much above *ours*, as *He's* above *us*. For otherwise the *Divine Three* having determin'd to make Man *so*; between the *Ectype* and the *Archetype* instead of just Analogy, there would have been rather disproportion, or disparaging incongruity. And then likewise as Man must have miss'd of the Measures fixt for his Nature; so GOD would have fail'd of his declar'd Intentions. And when did he ever suspend his design'd Favours from any, or divert from conferring them; unless by ill carriage they put in bars against them, which *Adam* uncreated could not do? And probably to intimate that Man has the *Three Lives* aforesaid; when GOD created *Adam*, he was said to breathe into his Nostrils not *the Breath of Life*; but *Nishmath Chajim*, *the Breath of Lives*, Gen 2. 7. For I suppose the *Likeness* of GOD in Man to consist much of this *tripple* LIFE; tho' His *Image* seems to be quite another thing to

to me ; as will appear in the sequel of the *Exposition* of this *Article*.

And then that these LIVES are *Identick* in their Nature, and that (according to this *Article*) *such* as *one* is, *such* are the other *two* : is evident from the account Scripture gives of them. For as that ascertains the First, by *Generation*, gives Being to the Second ; and the First and Second, by *Spiration*, to the Third. And when one infinitely pure and perfect LIFE begets another, and they two breathe a Third ; they must all be homogeneous, or of the same Kind : for what can such LIFE *beget*, or *breathe*, but such LIFE again, especially when every PERSON is a LIFE in the GODHEAD ? Does not a Fish beget a Fish ? and a Fowl, a Fowl ? Does not a Beast beget a Beast ? and a Man, a Man ? Why then should not the Blessed GOD, who is most Glorious LIFE, beget and breathe Blessed LIFE, and most Glorious GOD as well ; in His most Blessed and Glorious Way ?

But tho' they be of the same *Nature* and *Essence* ; they are sufficiently distinguished by their various *Origins*, or *Rises*. For the First LIFE was eternally *of himself* ; the Second an *Emanation* from Him ; and the Third an *Efflux* from both. The Second so rose from the First, as that he might be said to be *Begotten* ; and so the First is a *real* FATHER, and the Second as *real* a SON. And the

the Third so proceeded from them two, as that he might as properly be said to be *breathed*; and consequently he must be the SPIRIT of both, or their joint Living Breath; tho' as truly a VITAL PERSON as either. Now what better Marks, or clearer Characters of real Distinction *need* there, or *can* there be amongst the Glorious PERSONS of the Holy TRIAD; who at the same time are truly One? And thus we have not only a TRINITY of Names, or *Titles*; or one so Metaphysical as to consist of *Modes*, and *Relations*, and to have all its PERSONS the *same* with its Essence; and to be diversify'd by vain Differences none know how, and in reality not at all: but here are three true Hypostases, or *Living Subsistences* really different amongst themselves, and springing up in one Spiritual Substance different from them; tho' they all actuate and illiven it, and *in* and *by* it are *essentially* united. So that if we do not apprehend this TRINITY in Unity (and are of any good Capacity) the Fault ought not to be imputed to Obscurity in the Sacred TRIAD's *Constitution*: for tho' it be wonderful, it is very intelligible even to Admiration; as being more easy to be understood than our *own*, as will appear by what follows upon this *Article*.

But

44 *An Antidote against Arianism.*

But here I must remark. That For the Divine Essence to be rightly distinguish'd from the PERSONS, and for them to be so distinguish'd from one another by the common Hypothesis, is *utterly impossible*. Could any have rais'd them distinctly by *That*, I doubt not but a learned *Prelate* of our own would have done it effectually in an excellent Book of his. But tho' he attempt'd, he could not accomplish it, because the Hypothesis would not bear it. He there lays it down as a positive Assertion, that (o) *the Communication of the Divine Essence by the FATHER, is the Generation of the SON*. And declares that *CHRIST cannot have any part of it communicated to him but the whole*. And therefore affirms that it was communicated to him by a *total and plenary Communication*. Where leave out the relative Terms *FATHER*, and *SON*, and what the excellent Bishop asserts will amount to this much. That *the Communication of the whole Divine Essence, by and to the whole Divine Essence, is the Generation of the whole Divine Essence*. Which perhaps in the eyes of the Wise may look somewhat like wild and unintelligible Cant. And then how is it possible that the *FATHER* and the *SON* should be two di-

(o) *Bishop Pearson in his Exposition of the Apostle's Creed, on Artic. the 2d.*

distinct PERSONS? For what is the FATHER but the whole Divine Essence? And what is the SON but the same whole Essence? And so when the FATHER communicates the whole Essence to the SON, what does he but communicate *Himself*? And then Communication, according to the Bishop, being *Generation*; what does the Father beget by that generative Act, but *Himself*? And so the FATHER that begets must be the SON begotten, and the SON begotten the FATHER that begets: which are not Contradictions of the lowest Rank. Yet how can they be avoided here, when the Generating FATHER, and the SON Begotten, are both the whole Divine Essence? And further; what lower Contradiction can there well be, than to say, that one Divine PERSON who is *the whole Divine Essence*, does at the same time communicate *that whole Essence* which is his PERSON; to constitute *another PERSON* distinct from his own, by that very Essence which is his own PERSON? Yet thus it must be between the most Glorious FATHER and SON. But then they two must communicate the same *whole Essence* to the HOLY GHOST; and then if according to this good Bishop, *Communication* be *Generation*; so far as the SON communicates the Essence to him, he begets him: and so in the TRINITY there would be two Fathers,
one

one Son, and no Holy Ghost breath'd from both. Indeed the Bishop says, that *Communication* of the Essence to the HOLY GHOST is not Generation; but I find that to be *gratis dictum* only, and so the Charge stands good.

It must also be remembred, that *CHRIST is the one Mediator between GOD and Man*, 1 Tim. 2. 5. But if the SON be *the whole Divine Essence* which is the FATHER; he must unavoidably be a Mediator between *Himself and us*: which would be an Incongruity not very allowable.

Yet how fully does the first mention'd renowned Prelate come up to, and fall in with this same unhappy Doctrine? Which were it true, would certainly exclude the HOLY TRINITY, or abolish it out of being. For (p) he declares expressly, that *the same one Divine Nature is wholly and entirely communicated by the Eternal FATHER, to the Eternal SON, and by the FATHER and the SON to the Eternal SPIRIT. And this is the same which all TRINITARIANS assert.* The Great Man therefore delivers not this as his own private Sentiment; but vouches it for the General Opinion of all good Christians. Yet as formal and specious again as *this Assertion* seems, do but resolve these Terms, FATHER, SON, and HOLY-GHOST, in-

(p) *Bishop Stillingfleet. Vindicat. Chap. 7.*

to their true Sense, or just and genuine Signification; and so express them by *Divine Nature*, which they are all said to *import* by this eminent Writer, and the whole of which Nature, (according to him) every one of them must *be*; and then see and consider if it will not be too improper and imperfect to represent or express the Blessed TRINITY. For this must then be the Tenour or Form of the Assertion, in short. *The same one Divine Nature is wholly and entirely communicated by the Eternal Nature, to the Eternal Nature.* And here again Absurdities and Contradictions will break in afresh, and can no way be kept out. Nay, the very Doctrine here laid down to explicate and establish the Glorious TRINITY, will tend but to undermine and overthrow it. For if the FATHER be the one Divine Eternal Nature *wholly and entirely*; and the SON the same, and the HOLY GHOST the same: How can the PERSONS there be really distinguished either from the *Divine Nature*; or from *one another*? And without such Distinctions how can there be a real TRINITY?

First, *Distinct from That Nature the Sacred PERSONS cannot be.* For every one of them *is* that very Divine Nature, and of that one and the same whole and entire Nature *each* of them does *consist*. And then they can no more be distinct from it, than
that

that Nature can be different from it self. Besides, what is the Divine Nature but the Divine *Essence*? and what is that but an Infinite SPIRIT? And then the Three PERSONS if really distinct (as Persons should be) must be three infinite distinct Spirits; and so (as above noted) of necessity Three GODS. Here therefore it seems more than probable (and I was ready to lay it down as a sure *Axiom*) *that the PERSONS in the GOD-HEAD must be of a Different Quality from the Essence.* Else the GOD-HEAD must consist but of One PERSON, or the Three PERSONS in it must be Three DEITIES.

Nor Secondly, *Can those Holy PERSONS be distinct from one another.* For what is or can be more uniform or identick than the Divine Nature, or Essence? And if the adorable PERSONS consist all of that, and each of them be the *whole* of it; to offer to distinguish a PERSON from a PERSON in it, would be the same as to attempt to distinguish the whole Nature or Essence, from the whole Nature or Essence: *or to shew that a thing is different from what it is.* For so long as an Essence, a most simple Essence is one and the same; there can be no ground for its being different PERSONS. And so to talk of *each* of them, or of *every* of them, and of their being *Distinct*, may with the Judicious well seem
incon-

inconsistent, and sound extravagantly ; where there is nothing but one pure Essence to constitute three really distinct PERSONS, and its entire self is to be every one of them.

Yet thus our excellent Divines have taught, and to the Two fore-mention'd I might add a Third (a) *Prelate*, very learned in this Controversy, who is Symphonous *with*, or consenting *to* them. For he owns that (b) *the SON truly has the same Nature Divine in common with the FATHER, but communicated from him.* And this he declares to be not his own Opinion only, but to be approved by *all* the Catholick Doctors both before and after the *Nicene Council*. And the same we may conclude they Judged of the HOLY GHOST proportionably. And then what is this but running on directly in the old beaten but erroneous Track ? Pardon me that I say it is *erroneous*, for I prove it so by this one short but irrefragable Argument. In case the whole entire Divine Essence *be every PERSON*, then every Divine PERSON must necessarily be the *whole entire Divine Essence*. And then when the Second PERSON was incarnate,

(a) *Bishop Bull*

(b) *Filium eandem quidem Naturam Divinam cum Patre communem habere, sed à Patre communicatam, Vid. Defens. Synod. Nicæn. Sect. 4. Thes. 1.*

the whole entire Essence must be so. And then what innumerable as well as intolerable *Absurdities* (to call them no worse) must have been consequent thereunto ; when by reason of the whole Essence's being incarnate, every Divine PERSON must have been the same? Tho' how any true and distinct PERSONS should be in it, will be inconceivable.

So that according to the account which these learned Fathers, and deservedly celebrated Authors give of the TRINITY ; it seems *impossible* that it should ever be. For if the same one Divine Essence or Nature, be wholly and entirely the FATHER, and as wholly and entirely the SON, and also the HOLY GHOST ; and there's nothing to distinguish that Nature or Essence into PERSONS ; I appeal to all Rational, and Intelligent, as well as Learned Men ; if in the GOD-HEAD there can be more than one Divine *Essence* under three several *Titles*, or *Denominations* : and *they* for certain must be very far from being so many Divine PERSONS. And in case VITALITIES be set aside, it will be hard to find what else can in the Glorious Essence raise Three PERSONS. For as to the Things suggested and pretended to do it (not only by the lighter School-Doctors, but solideſt Divines, and even by learned and admirable Bishops of our own) they are *Modes*, and *Relations*. And these

(according to best Judges of them) are so far from being able to distinguish the Divine Essence into PERSONS (which must be a most glorious Work :) that they are but Phanxies floating in Men's Minds, which they putatively ascribe to GOD, and imaginarily fix upon His Essence as distinctive Characters of Divine PERSONALITIES there ; when they can be nothing so.

Should any alledge, that besides *Modes* and *Relations* there are Divine *internal Acts* in the DEITY, which contribute to the PERSONS there, if not actually *raise* Them; for the FATHER *Begets* the SON, and He and His SON *Breathe* the HOLY GHOST: I answer, These *Acts* tho' very true in themselves, and subservient to the great and high Ends mention'd, according to the *Vital Hypothesis* of the TRINITY ; yet in the *Modal one* they must be meer Phanxies, and fictitious things, according to what the Reverend quoted FATHERS have taught. For they assert that every PERSON is the *whole Essence*, or the *entire Divine Nature*. And then when one PERSON *begets* another, or They two *Breathe* the Third ; there is no Remedy but the whole entire Divine Essence, must Beget and Breathe the whole entire Divine Essence ; and so it must Beget and Breathe its whole and entire Divine Self. Which to affirm, would not only be a rank Absurdity,

E 2

but

52 *An Antidote against Arianism.*

but a monstrous and out-ragious Impossibility.

And then how wofully wretched and deplorable is it, that *wild Phansy*, or *chimerical Whimsy* should ever shut the true Idea, and genuine Knowledge of the Holy TRIAD out of our Minds; and make us take up in opinionative Notions, and groundless Prepossessions touching the same? Especially if allowing Divine LIFES in the GODHEAD, would set all right; as I am very willing to hope it would. I mean, by leading us out of that Labyrinth of confusion we are now in; into a clearer Knowledge of this grand Truth. Which being necessary to be understood in some good measure, and recommended to the Faith of *mean* Believers; in reason it must be more *intelligible* in it self, than the best Interpreters of it have yet made it: for generally speaking, instead of *explaining*, they have rather *perplex'd* it, by all they have said in Explication of it.

And might it induce any to close with the Notion of LIFES here, I can assure them it is so far from being a *new thing*, that GOD in the Old Testament calls Himself so, as oft as he speaketh of his *Soul*. For the word he then useth being *Nepheesh*, which the 70 render *Psyche*; both the Terms properly signify LIFE. And then St. *Ignatius*, in his Epistle to the *Ephesians* styles CHRIST,

GOD

GO
mo
An
He
GO
Y
as
it v
in
bit
he
and
the
GO
LI
LI
ed
I k
LIF
Cre
wh
ty'd
han
it w
unb
Sym
clou
and
ing

(9

GOD ἐν ἀθανάτῳ ζωῇ ἀληθινῇ : *in true immortal LIFE*; or as He really is such a LIFE. And by Irenæus (in his fourth Book against Heresies) it is often said, *DEUS est Vita*; GOD is LIFE. He there also calls Him Ὑπαρξις ζωῆς : *the Existence of LIFE*. And as I lately observ'd, by Eusebius Pamphilus it was embrac'd, and recommended too. For in the Creed which he drew up, and exhibited in the Nicene Council, and which (as he declared) he *believed when he was Priest, and preached when he was Bishop*: he owns the LORD JESUS CHRIST, the WORD of GOD, not only to be GOD of GOD, and LIGHT of LIGHT, but withal (q) LIFE of LIFE. And this he profess'd that he *learned out of Scripture*; as I indeed did, before I knew he had done so. But tho' he offer'd LIVES as he did, to be inserted into that Creed, which was then composing; and which would have cut the Knot that has ty'd such gross Absurdities upon us, and hamper'd us with so many Difficulties: yet it was unhappily rejected or omitted. I say unhappily; for had LIVES been put into that Symbol, we might have been free from that cloudiness and darkness in the TRINITY, and from such Disputes and Heats concerning it, as have often been too furious, and

(q) Ζωὴν ἐκ ζωῆς. Socrat. Eccl. Hist. lib. I. cap. 5.

54 *An Antidote against Arianism.*

sometimes fatal. For then the Divine PERSONS need not have been differenc'd by *Modes*, and *Relations*; as being really distinct amongst themselves, as they must be. Because *then* as *Eusebins* says (in the Creed which he tender'd to the aforesaid Council) the *FATHER* would have been a *FATHER* (r) indeed; the *SON* a *SON* indeed; and the *HOLY GHOST* an *HOLY GHOST* indeed: fairly intimating, that *otherwise* PERSONS they could not be, but in a *phanciful* and *fictionitious* way, as *Modal ones* are. In a word, then the PERSONS would have been so far from *Modal*, and *Relative*, that they would have been most *Real ones*: each of them being an infinitely Intelligent, Almighty, and Ever-living Agent. And so they must be PERSONS of the highest Nature and Quality possible, that is, *DIVINE*. Whereas according to the received Doctrine (I speak it with deep concern and trouble) they are but trivial and even feigned things; and they may be proved such.

For tho' in the GODHEAD there is an infinite SPIRIT which is the Divine Essence; yet how can the THREE PERSONS be made of that? Grant the FATHER (according to the common current Doctrine) is the whole Essence, and that the SON is the same; and also the HOLY GHOST. Yet then either

(r) Ἀληθῶς.

the *whole* *Essence* must be those THREE, or it must not. If it be not, what else according to the usual Hypothesis *can* they consist of? If they do consist of *that*, it must be either as it is *divided*, or as it is *entire*. *Divided* it can't be, because a SPIRIT is naturally Indivisible. If they consist of the *entire* *Essence*, they must be Three but notionally, for really they cannot be so. And if they be Three *notionally* only, the *Persons* themselves must be meer *notional* ones; they can be no better. To prove as much call the Divine *Essence* FATHER, and call it SON, and call it HOLY GHOST; and so apply three *Notions* to it, *Paternity*, *Filiation*, and SPIRATION. Now pray what *real* *Distinctions* do these *Relative Notions* make in it? Can they impart to it more than themselves have? If they can, then what becomes of that true and trite *Axiom*, *Nihil dat quod non habet*? *Nothing gives what it has not*? And if they to the Divine *Essence* can afford no more than themselves have, the Three they raise in it can be no more than three *Notionalities* at best. And by such *notional* *Diversifications*, the *Essence* can no more be three real PERSONS; than one Man can become three, by bearing three different *Names* or *Relations*. And if once it comes to this, that the Divine *Essence* can be *diversify'd* only *in a notional way*, and *into notional PERSONS*; the *Old Hypothesis* failing,

56 *An Antidote against Arianism.*

and falling to the Ground, a *New* one ought to be erected, when one agreeable can be thought of ; and then why not that of *Glorious VITALITIES*? Tho' glad I should be if that is not genuine, to see it thrust out by introduction of a better.

Should any object, that they can't conceive *how* the Three LIVES are in the GOD-HEAD: I answer, no more can any Mortal. That quite surmounts humane Knowledge here ; and in short the Case stands thus. The Adorable TRIAD is reveal'd from Heaven, and the Doctrine of it being Supernatural ; the true account of it must be had from the Hagiographa, or *Holy Writings* only. And if they teach there is *one* GOD, and that in him there are *Three*, FATHER, SON, and HOLY GHOST ; and that these are Three LIVES : thus far we go upon sure Grounds, and are under safest Conduct, as being in the happy Guidance of Heaven. But then tho' these are grand Truths, yet if a *general Knowledge* of them, be all that the World from above affords ; we must acquiesce *in*, and be content *with* it. For when GOD has condescended to acquaint us so far with his Glorious Nature in a *general way* ; then for us to enter into *Particulars*, and offer to shew *how* the FATHER begets the SON, and *how* They Two breathe the HOLY GHOST, and *how* all Three are in One Essence, and yet *how* they are distinct

stinct amongst Themselves : this would be giddy and presumptuous, and too rash and busy a Boldness. Indeed the vain and arrogant *Gnosticks* daringly undertook to explain the ways or modes *by* or *in* which the Glorious TRINITY arose ; but the result of their Studies prov'd nothing but empty Froth and Phansy. And no wonder, when the *Scripture* intimates it is a Task *impossible* ; and the pious *Fathers* have so pronounc'd it.

Scripture declares it in *Isai.* 53. The Chapter is but a pathetick Narrative of our SAVIOUR's Sufferings, Who is the eternal SON of GOD. And touching him it is query'd, *v.* 8. *who shall declare his Generation ?* Now as to *the thing it self* it is sufficiently declared, where He's said in the Gospel to be *the only* begotten SON of the FATHER : But the *Way* or *Mode* of it is inexplicable, as the Prophet's Question plainly implies. And thereunto the *Fathers* consent, says St. *Jerome.* (s) *It is impossible to know the Mysteries of the Divine Nativity.* And to him agrees St. *Ambrose*, his contemporary. (t) *Impossible it is to know the Secret of this Generation, That the SON is born it*

(s) Impossibile est divinæ nativitatis nosse mysteria.
In loc.

(t) Licet scire quod filius natus sit, non licet discutere quomodo natus sit. *Lib. de Fid. ad Gratian.*

58 *An Antidote against Arianism.*

may be known; but how he was brought forth it is not lawful to examine. And then who would venture upon such a Scrutiny?

Therefore to give check to it, it may be consider'd, that the *Enquiry would be as vain, as audacious.* For to discern and discover the *Modes* of things is to us *impossible now*, whatever it may be in the Future State. And who would go upon an invincible Task? or ever undertake what is really impracticable? Let best Philosophers, ablest Physicians, or the most Knowing of any Calling, or Character, explain the *Triple LIFE* in Man; and oblige the Learned if they can, with a clear and satisfactory Account of it. But if *that* be a Work of insuperable Difficulty, and such as would puzzle the finest Wits, and the quickest and brightest Faculties: who can unfold the Divine TRIAD, or shew how the Three LIVES are in the GODHEAD?

Yet if the Three PERSONS there be made as *intelligible* to us, as the *Triple Life in Man* is; and so we understand as *much of GOD* proportionably, as we do of *our selves*: surely we ought to rest in this, as a competent Knowledge, and to be highly pleas'd with it. Especially when we have Cause to think, that he will never reveal Himself *farther* to us in this World. And perhaps for good Reason; even because a freer Manifestation of Himself might minister to

Curi-

Curiosity, and so rather indanger than advantage us.

But this I must note as *very remarkable*. That GOD in one main respect, has graciously display'd His Being to us more clearly, than He has done, or we can do our own. It appears thus. Touching the Three Glorious LIVES in Himself, he has given us plainly to understand, that the Second is Begotten by the First; and that the Third Proceeds from Both. But as to our Lives, as we have no information from Him; so neither can we learn of our selves how they Rise. We may observe indeed, that one of them, the *Vegetative*, is singly in Plants; and that two of them the *Vegetative* and *Sensitive*, are combin'd in Brutes; to which in our selves the *Rational* is annexed. But tho' we can thus see they are separate, or conjoin'd, according to the Beings in which they are lodg'd; yet where all meet in our selves, whether the Lower results from the Higher, we cannot tell. And when we know more of the Three LIVES in GOD, than we do of the Trinal LIFE in our selves, we have little cause to complain of the *Mysteriousness* of his Nature; but great reason, to be thankful for that Knowledge of it he has honour'd us with.

And truly such it is, that it seems to supersede all *Mystery* in the TRINITY.
For

60 *An Antidote against Arianism.*

For GOD having declar'd that He *is* (s) a SPIRIT; and that in this SPIRIT there are *Three*, by name, (t) FATHER, SON, and HOLY GHOST; and that (u) the FATHER hath a LIFE in Himself, and the SON hath a LIFE in Himself, from Him; and that the (w) SPIRIT (or HOLY GHOST) is a LIFE breathed from Both: This account thus given by GOD, does so well inform us as to the Being of the TRINITY; that we know both from whence it Rises, and of what it Consists. For besides the infinite SPIRIT, or *Essence* where those LIVES spring up, nothing else is needful to compleat the Blessed TRIAD but *They*; and all might interrogate, who can conceive what could do it better, or so well?

For by being LIVES, as they are so sufficiently distinguish'd from the *Essence* (want of which distinction was the great *Flaw* in the Old Hypothesis of the TRINITY, and will be its utter *Ruine*;) so tho' they are all LIVES, yet subsisting as they do, the First, *of Himself*; the Second, *by Him*; and the Third, *from Both*: By this means they must be *Three* truly and distinctly. Three PERSONS, that is, as distinct as the LIFE Beget-

(s) John 4. 24.

(t) Matt. 28. 19.

(u) John 5. 26.

(w) Rom. 8. 10.

ting is from the LIFE Begotten ; and as the LIFE Breathed, is from them who did Breathe it. A Theorem, or Notion so very plain, that what Christians of common Sense cannot competently apprehend it ? For what can be more obvious, or easy to be understood, than a Spirit in which there are Three Lives, which by springing up, and being propagated in ; and by actuating That Spirit become Three PERSONS, and so are a real TRINITY : and as they all enliven the *same Spirit*, by being so *essentially One* ; in that regard are as real a UNITY ? Who amongst *Christians* of any good Capacity (with a little instruction) can't soon attain to the Knowledge of this ? And fit it is they should, the TRINITY in UNITY being a chief Article of that Faith, upon which their Eternal Welfare depends ; as this Creed Orthodoxly teaches in the Beginning of it. And the All-wise GOD having made the Belief of *this*, useful and *necessary* to their *Salvation* ; can we think it should be utterly inexplicable by the *Wise* ; and no more intelligible to the *Vulgar*, than a Mathematical Problem is to an illiterate Mechanick ? Ground upon it we may therefore (when the Article was to serve so high an end) it could never be of so abstruse a Nature. I mean, it could never be so *mystical* as GOD recommended it, but was made so only by

Mens

62 *An Antidote against Arianism.*

Mens *mis-understanding* it, and putting false and abusive *Glosses* upon it.

Now is it not strange, that the noblest Revelation the Church ever had, should by garish *School Writers* chiefly be turned into ænigmatical Nonsense? When had they labour'd but half as much in *Searching the Scriptures*, as they did in minting and maintaining empty *Subtilties*; they might there have found it was naturally *clear*, and for a Truth so Glorious, reasonably *perspicuous*. And which is more surprizing and amazing still, as Men of Learning wretchedly struck into such incongruous and darkning Notions of the TRINITY; so they unhappily *persisted* in them for hundreds of Years.

O that ever Doctrines containing such Stuff, as the mention'd Writers deliver'd on this sublimest Head; should be taught and urg'd for a *Prime Article* of the Christian Faith! Where was found Reason when such frothy Phancies and frivolous Doctrines sway'd the Minds, and fill'd the Mouths and Books of Divines? And what was become of solid Judgment, and of sober and religious Science; when a great part of the Christian World sunk into such Ignorance, and was so blinded and seduc'd with fallacy? And which is still most astonishing of all, egregious Error was here magisterially obtruded upon Men as a profound and sacred *Mystery*, when it was but a meer
per-

perplex'd Scheme of nauseous Inconsistencies. When I think seriously of this, how much, and how long the Highest Point in our holy Religion has been hidden from us ; and how very strangely and grossly it has been mis-interpreted, even by Persons of eximious Piety, and profoundly Learned : I can't but sit down in deep amazement.

Tho' were it demanded *how* the Doctrine of the Blessed TRIAD came to be thus mistaken, deprav'd, and made shamefully *Mystical* ; perhaps I might point at the true Cause, or proper Source of that Unhappiness. And in a word, it seems to have been the *Antichristian Church*. For in *Rev. 17. 5.* the *Apocalyptist* tells us of a *Woman* he beheld (in a rapturous or visionary way) on whose *Fore-head a Name was written*, and the First Title of that Name was MYSTERY. Now this Woman in all likelihood symbolically represented *that Church*. And then *Mystery* being the first word in her Name, it might import or plainly *fore shew*, that she would invent and impose *Mysterious Doctrines*. And tho' she would be sure to teach them for great *Truths*, excellent in their *Nature*, and as to their *Ends* and *Uses* as *admirable*. Yet when at length the Pious, and Pure, and Wise should come to consider them, and look narrowly into them ; They would not be able to bear the Test of their piercing Judgment : but would soon be found *wile*,
as

64 *An Antidote against Arianism.*

as well as *vain* things ; and not only *dange-
rous*, but *destructive*. For how well soever
they were imbellisht, and gilt ; and how
plausible and specious soever they might
before have been : they would *then* appear
to be evil in Themselves, pernicious to Men,
and to GOD most odious and abominable.
And if after such discoveries made of them,
they still go for *Mysteries* ; they must be
rank'd with the *worser* sort, and reckon'd
Mysteries of INIQUITY. Of which Na-
ture is the Doctrine of *Transubstantia-
tion*, and of the *Adoration of the Host*,
and others which *that* Church teaches
and maintains. And of that Number is
this Doctrine of the HOLY TRINITY :
I mean, as it has been taught by them of *her*
Communion, for so far it is one of *her* ig-
noble and counterfeit *Mysteries*. For it was
too much *her* way, *involvere sententias Ser-
monibus imperitis* ; to *darken Counsel* by
Words without Knowledge, Job 38. 2: or to
wrap up Opinions in imprudent Expressions.
That is, in plain terms, to misrepresent
Truths by forcing wrong meanings upon
them ; and having corrupted and clouded
them by weak glosses, and erroneous inter-
pretations, to obtrude them upon Men as
valuable Mysteries, tho' nothing made them
Mysterious but Nonsense. And thus she did
not only falsify the *precious Doctrines* of
CHRIST ; but by transfusing ill Notions in-

to Peoples Minds, perverted their Judgments by vain misperswasions touching the same.

And truly to call or count the TRINITY it self a *real and deep Mystery* ; I think would be but to disparage and degrade its Nature, as well as to darken and diminish its Dignity. For notwithstanding its transcendent infinite Excellency, *This* is its peculiar and wonderful GLORY, that *it is still intelligible, and easy to be understood.* I grant that much of *feigned* Obscurity, or of forc'd and *artificial* Mystriousness has been imputed to, or put upon it : but what reason is there to *think* it Mystrious, or to call it so ? when in the HOLY Books it is no where so *termed*, tho' other things are. Should any here object ; *even you your self make the TRINITY a Mystery.* For you say, the Three LIVES there, are all united to that Infinite SPIRIT which is their common Essence ; and *who can tell HOW that is done ?* I answer, I do suppose them so united, and that we know not now. But then I add , that for this we have no cause to complain of Religious *Mystery*, in the Case under consideration, when we know as little of *our selves.* For who can say how the *Triple Life* is join'd to our Beings ? But the Objection running wholly upon *Modes*, if ever our Knowledge be so improv'd, as to discover the Modes in *our selves* ; we may possibly attain to such a

Pitch of Sagacity, as to descry those in the *Divine Nature*. And so still I stand to what I said; that our *own Nature* is *proportionably* as un-intelligible, as that of the most Blessed GOD, which yet was never call'd a *Mystery*.

And that the DEITY is very perspicuous, it may be the Gospel does proclaim. Witness that *Aphorism* in the 1 St. *John* 1. 5. *GOD is Light, and in Him is no Darkness at all*. Which as it shews Him absolutely pure from Moral Pollution; so it may farther point at the *clearness* of his *Being* from *Mysterious Obscurity*. As much as to say, His Divine Nature is so far from being *Mystical*, that 'tis rather *Transparent as the very Light*.

Indeed if we behold Him thro' vain *Hypotheses*, or conceited *Doctrines* of Men; which in high things often cast mists before our Eyes; no wonder if we fall into gross Mistakes, and entertain wrong Thoughts or Ideas of Him. But in case we view and wisely consider Him, as he has pleas'd to reveal and describe Himself; looking at His Nature thro' the Glass of Scripture, with the Eye of right Reason, the common Helps given to discern His Excellencies: we shall find *no darkness at all* in Him. Nothing so cloudy as to hinder us from fair conceptions of Him; but rather such clear and quick Apprehensions, as will help us to know Him
pro-

proportionably as well in a general way as we usually do even a *Man* like our selves. For what is GOD but an *Infinite Spirit*, in which are Three as Infinite LIVES, with all Infinite Divine Perfections which consummate his *Infinite* Divine Nature? Now is not this as true and adæquate a *Notion* of GOD, as we can frame of any Ordinary *Man*? For what is *he* but a Soul and Body united, in which *Finite Being* there is a Triple Finite Life, with all Finite Humane Powers and Faculties needful to compleat his Humane Nature? And is not the Idea of GOD then as easy to be form'd as that of a Man, by tolerable Understandings?

Should it be answer'd, *no*; for GOD is *Infinite* and so we can't comprehend Him: I would reply thus. To *Comprehend*, is one thing; to *Apprehend*, is another. And tho' what is *Infinite* we can't *Comprehend*, yet *Apprehend* it we may. For what is a *Finite Being*, but a thing *limited*? Whereas one *Infinite*, is immense and *boundless*. But then as we conceive *Man* naturally *Finite*, because he *has Limits*; can't we as well conceive GOD naturally *Infinite*, because he *has none*? And is it not alike easy to conceive thus of the One, and the Other respectively? Which yet if we do, we have an equally true Idea of Both.

68 *An Antidote against Arianism.*

But it being hinted *above* upon this Article, that the *Image* of GOD lies not chiefly in our *Triple Life*; but *principally* in *some what else*: it remains to be shew'd *what that* is in which it consists.

That Man particularly and beyond all other Creatures, was created in GOD's own *Image*, is most certain, as being expressly declar'd, *Gen. 1. 27.* But then it may not be improper to enquire, *what that Image* of GOD is in configuration to which Man was made. For as the great variety of their Opinions witness, the *Learned* seem to be at a *Loss* for it. *St. Basil* places this Image in Man's *Free Will*. *St. Chrysostom* in his *Dominion over the Creatures*. *St. Austin* in his *Reason*. And every of these Fathers have their respective Followers.

The *Jews* seem to make it up of the *Qualities*, or *Endowments* of his *Soul*, as they are Shadows or Resemblances of the *Divine Perfections*. Thus as GOD is *one*, and *fills Heaven*, and *sees others*, but is *invisible* Himself: so it is, say they, with the *Soul* of Man. It is but *one*, *replenishes the Body*, and is *seen of none*, tho' it *beholds others*. But upon this *Lyra* (on *Gen. 1. 26.*) passes a just Censure; where he says, (x) *That assignation of the Image is too full of Accidents*. And when the

(x) Ista assignatio Imaginis videtur nimium accidentalis.

Learned are so little agreed touching this *Image*, and know not well what to make of it ; this makes it suspicious that somewhat *more* may be meant by it than what is *usually* understood.

Others again will have the Image of GOD to lie in Man's *Innocent* and *Pure Nature*, with his *Command* of this Sublunary World : and this seems to be the common Opinion.

But then if GOD's Image in Man consisted of *Purity* and *Uprightness* ; what became of that Image when *Adam* fell into Sin, and utterly lost it ? For then he could not propagate it to others, because he had it not in himself. Yet long after our first Parents *Fall*, and their *forfeiture* of Original Integrity ; *they descending* from them did nevertheless bear the Image of GOD, S. *Jā.* 3. 9. For the Apostle there speaking of *Men in general*, calls them *Men born after the Image of GOD*.

And in case this Image be own'd to lie in Man's *Dominion* over his fellow Creatures, yet so we may still be wide of the Truth. For that was not only equally, but more *eminently* in *Angels*. For they as (y) Scripture attests, and Fathers allow ; are *Guardians* and *Princes* over *Countries*, and *Nations* : and so have *Dominion* not over other

(y) Dan. 10. 13. & 20. 21.

Creatures only, but over *Men* themselves. And then when GOD made Man, and indu'd him with that privilege, He therein could do no more than He had done already for *Angels*; which likewise may be said as to their *Spiritual* Nature, and Excellencies. Yet that making Man in His *own Image*, was a thing *new*, and *extraordinary*; and a special or *peculiar Favour*: is intimated by what he spake when he set about it; *let us make Man in our Image, after our Likeness*. And why should GOD deliberate (let me say) or consult about this as a *strange Work* not yet effected; if he had before done it in making higher Creatures? This may imply therefore that Man was made like GOD, in quite *another way* than Angels were. And besides being like Him in that fair instance of Similitude noted, as he has a *Triple Life* in him, answerable to the Three *Vitalities* in the DEITY; he might *resemble* Him in his *corporeal Shape*, or *Figure* too.

That he is like GOD in *Soul*, or *Mind* we need not doubt. For as what *Philo* says of the *Mind* of Man is true; that 'tis (a) a *Divine Particle*: so what he speaks in another place is as certain; that GOD is (b) *the Archetype of rational Nature*, of which

(a) Ἀπόσπασμα θεῶν. Lib. de Somn.

(b) Ἀρχέτυπον φύσεως λογικῆς. Quod deter, potior.
 &c. Lib. 2.

Man is (c) *the Likeness or Resemblance*. But then besides that Man resembles GOD in his *Soul*, he may do it in his *Body* likewise. Else *Angels* are as much *Types* of GOD as *He*, and have his *Likeness* more perfectly stamp'd upon them; and therefore to bear his *Image* in a more *peculiar* way (as seems to have been *consulted* and *agreed*;) he must do it *Bodily*. And tho' that supposes GOD to wear a *Body*, yet the Dispensation may be very true, how *strange* soever it may seem to any. For my own part I appeal to *Reason*, and to the *Judicious* (who as they are greatest Masters of it, so can use it best) whether those words, *let us make Man in our Image*; do not, and *must* not import as much; if we rightly observe how they run, and thro'ly understand, what they mean. For the *Divine Three* here concern'd, do not say, let us make Man *like our selves*; but let us make Man *in our Image*. Now should I ask, what is GOD? I presume it would be answer'd, He is a SPIRIT, and an *infinite* one. But then pray, what *Image* can an infinite Spirit have? Yet as we find in *Gen. 1. 27.* GOD created Man in his own Image; and to ascertain the Favour, he repeats it, *in the Image of GOD created He him*. But then Man being created in the *Image* of GOD, and GOD as an immense Spirit being

(c) Μίμημα ἢ ἐπικρίσιμα. *Ib.*

incapable of any *natural Image*; it is necessary that he should have an *ascititious* and *bodily* one.

And truly no less seems to be signified by Himself, in the Words noted and repeated: *let us make Man in our Image, after our Likeness.* Not only כְּדִמּוּתֵנוּ *after our Likeness*, which may refer to Likeness *Spiritual* and *Moral*; and so is render'd by the *Seventy*, ἀπὸ εἰκονώσεως, *after our Resemblance*; and by the *Vulgar*, ad Similitudinem, *after our Similitude*: but בְּצַלְמֵנוּ *in our Image*, (which as all must grant who know any thing of the *Hebrew Tongue*) implies a *Bodily Likeness*. And therefore when *Adam* begat *Seth*, he is said to beget him כְּדִמּוּתוֹ *after his Likeness* as to his *Soul*; but בְּצַלְמוֹ *in his Image* too, as to his *Body*. A very clear tho' tacit intimation, that when *GOD* formed *Adam*, however he might make his *Soul* after his *Spiritual Likeness*; yet his *Body* was made in his *own corporeal Image*. And accordingly *Iselem*, the Word which *GOD* makes use of to express *his Image*; is us'd for the *Molten Images* of the *Gentiles*, *Numb.* 33. 52. And for *the Images* of *Baal*. 2 *King.* 11. 18. And for *Nebuchadnezzar's Golden Image*, *Dan.* 3. 5. Some indeed would have *Iselem* signify a *Shadow*, and so would make the Image of *GOD* in *Man* to be *umbratilis*, a *shadowy* one; and so *Man* is said to walk, *Betselem*, *in a Shadow*, *Psal.* 39. 7. But
where

where 'tis us'd in that sense, as the learned Schindler well observes, it is in way of *Metonymy*; and so the word is drawn from its proper to a *figurative* Signification. Let me add, that in the 20th of *Exodus*, where *Pesel* is us'd for a *Graven Image* forbidden in the Second Commandment; the *Targum* calls it *Isalem*, whereby GOD speaks his *Image in Man*; which farther intimates *that* to be *Material*. And therefore the *Septuagint* translates it *Eikon*, which, says *Scapula*, signifies the *Semblance*, or *Effigies*, *proprie rei corporeæ*, properly of a corporeal thing: and for it quotes *Æschylus*, *Socrates*, *Plutarch*, and others. And accordingly the Word in the *Vulgar*, is *Imago*, an *Image*. Which *Martinus* [in vocabul. *Similitudo*] will have to consist of proper *Lineaments* which have no place but in what is *Bodily* again. For as linear Features must be express'd in what is *Corporeal*; so without *Body* nothing can be a true *Image*, according to his Notion.

But then that Man might be made in the *Image* of GOD, he must be fashion'd after the *Shape* or *Figure* of that *Body* which GOD had been pleas'd to take to Himself. Tho' that He should assume a *Body*, none need wonder in the least, there being so very good *reason* for it. For as it was highly reasonable that He who made the World should *Govern* it; so in favour to the noblest

74 *An Antidote against Arianism.*

blest Creatures, I mean the *Angels*, who were *first* in it, and withal, *innumerable* ; he might think it reasonable to govern them with a *visible* Hand. For then his Regiment would be the more easy and familiar, because so his Subjects might not only see, but humbly *converse* with their Almighty Ruler. Upon this account therefore GOD from the beginning might chuse to *actuate a Body*. And He assuming a Body, there would be GOD in a *Corporeal Image*. And then making Man after that in *his own Image*, was making him in the *Form* of his assumed Body : of that Body he took to appear and act in as the *great Monarch*, or Supreme Head and Governour of the *Spiritual World*. And so that Body of his must needs be of the same *Figure* with ours ; because ours was made *conform* to His. And by virtue of it he must be much the fitter to Command the World of Spirits, as being visible to them over whom he was ever to preside ; which otherwise he could not have been.

But when I say GOD was pleas'd to *take and wear* an Image ; I mean that every of the Three Glorious PERSONS *did*, and *do* the same : and the Words that prefac'd Man's *Formation*, *insinuate* or imply as much. For (as has been said) they were these ; *let us make Man after our Image*. Where note, that they were spoken by *Elohim* ; as if the *Holy Three* utter'd them. And then what
Image

Image one had, the other two must have the like; for had any one of them been *without an Image*, or had he worn a *different one*; how could they have said truly, *let us make Man after our Image*? or how could they have possibly *done it*? Suppose three Men should say, let us make a *Statue* after our Shape; would not the Expression strictly, and strongly import, that all the *Three* had the humane Likeness? and consequently that the *Statue* must be made according to it? And why then should not the Clause aforesaid as plainly imply, that the Divine Three must have an *Image* according to which Man was to be form'd? And as the *Statue* made in the one case, must bear the *Image* of *Man*: so the *Man* made in the other case, must bear the *Image* of GOD.

And that the Holy Three have each of them an *Image* in humane Figure, symbolically representing their adorable selves: I shall endeavour to make out.

And first, touching the FATHER: That He has such an *Image*, may be gather'd from Exod. 33. 22, 23. *And it shall come to pass, while my Glory passeth by, that I will put thee in a cleft of the Rock; and will cover thee with my hand while I pass by. And I will take away my hand, and thou shalt see my back-parts; but my Face shall not be seen.* The Words are an Answer to Moses his Petition at the 18th verse:

18th verse: *I beseech Thee, shew me Thy Glory.* Which GOD having promis'd to do, He here declares how it should be done. Particularly He informs him, that his *Glory* should pass by him. Not his *Essence* or *Being*; for as *Moses* did not desire to see that, so it is *Invisible*; and withal being *Infinite*, and so every where, it could not possibly pass before him, as being incapable (thro' its *Ubiquitariness*) of moving from place to place. The thing therefore that *Moses* besought GOD to shew him, was his *Glory*. *Corpoream aliquam excellentem formam*, said the learned *Rivet*: *Some corporeal excellent Form.* He might as well have said, *His Body*. And that he has one, is manifest from the words cited. For they mention his *Back parts*, which were seen; and his *Face*, which was not to be seen; and his *Hand*, which was so to cover *Moses*, as that *the one might be seen, and not the other*. Not that GOD was *unwilling* to shew *Moses* his *Face*, but the *Sight* of it would have been fatal to his *Life*. The very reason GOD gave for his not seeing it, *v. 20. Thou canst not see my Face, for no Man shall see my Face and live.* For were a *bad Man* to see it, the *Glory* of it, to him would be so terrible, as to fright him to *Death*. And were a *good Man* to see it, it would so influence his *Soul*, as delightfully to exhale it (let me say) out of his *Body*, by its ravishing and overpowering

ering Sweetness. But then when GOD owns He has a *Face*, and *Back-parts*, and an *Hand*; may he not have a *Body* of our Shape?

And do we not learn as much from *Exod.* 24. 10? For there it is said of *Moses*, and *Aaron*, *Nadab*, and *Abihu*, and *Seventy of the Jewish Elders*; that they *saw the GOD of Israel*: and that there was under his Feet, as it were the *Body of Heaven in clearness*. I confess the *Samaritan Version* renders it, *they feared the GOD of Israel*: as if ירא the Word for, *saw* there, had come from ירא *he hath feared*. But then in the following verse, it is said again of those Nobles, that they *saw GOD*; and the Word there being יחיו it puts it past all manner of doubt, that they did *see GOD*: for the proper Signification of יחיו is, *he hath seen*. But then this plainly shews that he must have a *Celestial Body*; for as his naked *Essence* never *was*, so it never *can* be seen. And therefore where he proclaims himself *Eternal*, and *Immortal*; He declares as positively and expressly that He is *Invisible*, 1 Tim. 1. 17. Tho' if he had not so declar'd, his *Spiritual Nature* would have dictated the same, to every intelligent philosophick Mind. I must also note, that the *GOD of Israel* whom they *saw*, is there said to have *Feet*; which does not only argue he has a *Body*, but that his *Body* may still be shap'd like ours, by
vir-

78 *An Antidote against Arianism.*

virtue of another Feature common to
us.

Memorable it is also to the present purpose, what GOD said of *Moses*, Num. 12. 8. *With him will I speak Mouth to Mouth, even apparently, and the Similitude of the LORD shall he behold.* Where, as it was GOD Himself (we are assur'd) who would speak to *Moses* so openly, even *mouth to mouth*, (as a Man speaketh to his Friend, Exod. 33. 11.) and would appear to him so plainly, that he should *behold his Similitude*. so the תמונה or *Similitude*, or *Image* of Him which he was to behold, must be his *heavenly Body*; which doubtless was exceeding bright and glorious. And therefore the *Seventy* call it Δόξαν ΚΥΡΙΟΥ, *the Glory of the LORD*. Yet that Glory was not so radiant neither, as to have its Shape made indiscernible by its glittering splendor. For notwithstanding its lucid shining Clarity, a distinct Form, and even an *humane Figure* might be seen in it. And therefore *Meno-chius* upon the place, calls it (a) *GOD in a Corporal Image, or Form; which Form was the humane Image of CHRIST to come.* He might as well have said, it was GOD Himself in *humane Likeness*. And that it was not a Symbolical Type, or some confused lumi-

(a) DEUM in specie corporali, quæ species (ut verisimilimum est) erat humana CHRISTI venturi Imago.

nous Scheme ; nor yet an Angelical stately Representation, but GOD in Person : the *Vulgar* Translation offers to perswade, as it terms the apparent Image there, *Figuras Dominum, the Shapes, or Features* which were the *LORD*.

I only add, That as we read often in the Sacred Books, of *CHRIST's sitting, or standing* at GOD's Right Hand in Heaven ; so the blessed Proto-Martyr Stephen saw Him there in the latter Posture, *Act. 7. 55.* For *looking up stedfastly into Heaven, he saw the Glory of GOD, and JESUS standing on the Right Hand of GOD.* Now as *CHRIST's* standing at *GOD's* Right Hand, evinceth that He has a *Right Hand* ; so that supposing a *Left*, both imply that the Glorious Body of *GOD* the *FATHER* must be the more like *ours*. From what more immediately goes before, three things may here be observ'd.

1st. That *GOD's Image is his Body*. For a naked Spirit, being invisible, can be seen of none, in any Similitude, nor can it ever put on Shape or Figure.

2^{dly}. That *His Body is His visible Glory*. And therefore when he gave *Moses* a transient Sight of *his Body's Back-parts*, he is said to shew him his *Glory*.

3^{dly}. That *the Face of GOD's Body is too glorious to be seen by Mortals*. And therefore tho' *GOD* promis'd to shew *Moses* his *Glory*,

80 *An Antidote against Arianism.*

Glory, yet to him he could exhibit his *Body's Back-parts* only. To have shew'd him his *Face* would have cost him his *Life*. And tho' that to *Moses* could have been no Injury, yet *GOD* having Work for him to do on Earth, he was here to continue till that was consummate.

And that *GOD the SON had a Body from the Beginning*, and long before his Incarnation; we have cause to think. For according to the learned *Jews*, משיח the *Name* or *Person* of the *Messiah*, was one of those things which were before the *World*. And therefore *JEHOVAH* is said to possess Him in the beginning of his way, before his works of old, *Prov. 8. 22*. And in the next verse he proclaims of himself, *I was set up from everlasting, from the Beginning, or ever the Earth was*.

And as he was in being thus early; so he was deeply concern'd, and very active in *Humane Affairs* all along, as *Tertullian* represents. For he affirms plainly, (a) *The SON it is who judged from the beginning, breaking down the proudest Tower, dividing the Tongues, ruining the whole World by the violence of Waters, raining fire and brimstone upon So-*

(a) Filius est qui ab initio judicavit, Turrim superbissimam elidens, linguasque dispersiens, pluens super Sodomam & Gomorram Ignem & Sulphurem; Dominus a Domino. Ipse enim & ad humana Colloquia descendit; ab *Adamo* usq; ad *Patriarchas* & *Prophetas*, &c. *Lib. Cont. Præx. cap. 16.*

dom and Gomorrah, the LORD from the LORD. He also came down to talk with Men, from Adam even to the Patriarchs and Prophets, in Vision, in Dream, in Appearance, in Mystery, always from the beginning making way to the state of his which he was to prosecute to the end.

And before him *Justin Martyr* deliver'd the same things almost: declaring that he spake to the Fathers of old, and to the Prophets, and appeared to *Moses* in the form of fire in the Bush, and the like; in his second *Apology*; and in his *Dialogue with Trypho* &c. And that *Origen* was of the same mind is evident. For in his first Book against *Celsus*, he says, that CHRIST ποικίλη σοφία καὶ ποικίλαις δυνάμεσι, *by multiform Wisdom, and various Powers*, did first institute τὸν Ἰουδαϊσμόν, *the Jewish Religion*, μετὰ δ' αὐτὸν τὸν Χριστιανισμόν, *and after that the Christian it self*. But in setting up the Jewish Worship our Blessed LORD could have had no hand, unless He *pre-existed*. Nor indeed could the *Israelites* be properly said to have tempted CHRIST in the Wilderness; which yet is expressly laid to their charge, 1 Cor. 10. 9: and so must be true.

But then as CHRIST *pre-existed* a great while before he was incarnate; so that he did it for us, and in a Body like ours in Figure; we need not doubt, in case what *Tertullian* says be Truth. For speaking of Man's

Formation after the Image of GOD, he says; *erat autem ad cuius imaginem faciebat; he was like to him after whose Image he made him: ad Filii scilicet, that is, to the SON's.* Which plainly implies that when Man was made, the SON of GOD did wear an *humane Likeness*, as well as the FATHER: tho' afterwards it was to be more gross and visible. For as it there follows, He was to be *homo certior & verior*; a more manifest and truer Man. And so indeed he was, when he was made *Flesh*. Which as it was spoken by the SPIRIT, so allow that when He overshadow'd the blessed Virgin, He converted the Messiah's *pre-existent* Body into his *Carnal* one in her Womb; and then the Phrase will be more emphatically true in a stricter propriety. And as he long since took our *Flesh* upon him, so he will never perhaps put it off again; and consequently in the Heavens above, He will always appear in *more* than our Image.

And lastly, that the HOLY GHOST does, and ever will bear *our Likeness* above; we may reasonably believe. For in *other* Similitudes, and in *meaner* ones he has appear'd. As in that of fiery cloven *Tongues*, Acts 2. And in that of a *Dove*. Touching which, besides that the three other Evangelists affirm, that He descended upon JESUS at his Baptism *like a Dove*; and testify that *John* the Baptist saw Him do it: St. *Luke* declares that

that He descended *σωματικῶς εἶδεν* (a) in a Bodily Shape like a Dove upon Him. And accordingly (b) St. Austin owns that the HOLY SPIRIT sat upon his head in specie Columbæ, *in the Shape of a Dove*. (c) Origen also mentions the HOLY SPIRIT's appearing *ἐν εἶδει περιεργᾶς*: *in the Shape of a Dove*, more than once. And before him another Father, Tertullian, averr'd, that (d) the SPIRIT which descended in the Body of a Dove rested upon the LORD. And indeed was ready to maintain that this Dove was hypostatically one with the Blessed SPIRIT; lest by granting its Body to have been but counterfeit and representative; he must have yielded CHRIST's Flesh to have been no better. And before them all Justin Martyr in his Dialogue with Trypho, speaks (e) of the Spirit that came down in the Shape of a Dove. And affirms the HOLY GHOST to have (f) flown upon HIM, meaning CHRIST. I insert these Authorities here the rather, because I find the great Dr. Hammond against the SPIRIT's visible Descent upon our SAVIOUR.

(a) Lu. 3. 22.

(b) De Agon, Christian. cap. 22.

(c) Cont. Cels. li. 1.

(d) SPIRITUM Columbæ Corpore delapsam desedisse super Dominum. De Carn. Christ Cap. 3.

(e) Τὸ ἐπελθόντ' ἐν εἶδει περιεργᾶς Πνεύματ'.

(f) Ἐπιπλεῖν ἐπ' Αὐτόν.

84 *An Antidote against Arianism.*

But farther yet. The same Good SPIRIT has manifested his vast Kindness and Esteem for us, in bestowing his Heavenly Graces, and excellent Gifts upon us. And which still comes nearer to the case in hand, he calls our very *Bodies* (these *vile* Bodies) his *Temples*; and he makes them *so*, and dwells in them *as such* by his special Presence. All which rightly consider'd, we need not question, but *He*, as well as the *other Two* Divinest PERSONS, does now, and will for ever Grace us by wearing a Body, a most Glorious Body of the Form of ours, in the Kingdom of Heaven. But then the Body of Man being Originally made like *Theirs*; Man must be made in the *Image* of GOD. The thing I was to shew.

And that Man's Body was made after the fashion or Figure of GOD's; several Reasons, or Considerations may prompt us to think. As, *1st* To verify or make good the Scripture.

How read we there, Gen 1. 27? GOD created Man in his own Image, in the Image of GOD created He him. Where as the Image of GOD is twice exprest, so the Original Word *Isalem*, us'd both times for it, fairly points at a *Bodily Image*, as was observ'd. And truly the ingeminated Assertion of the thing implies it the more strongly. And well it may; for as *Imago rei non est res ipsa*; the Image of a thing is not the thing it self; so

so it is remarkable that GOD did not say, let us make Man *as we our selves are* : but let us make Man *in our Image, after our Likeness*. Nor did he make him in any *Natural Image* of his own because he had none. For GOD being an infinite SPIRIT he could have no regular external Form in himself, no manner of set Figure or Similitude at all. And therefore Man for certain could not be made in the *Image* of GOD's Essence. For his naked abstracted *Being* can no more be represented, than there can be a *visible Invisibility* ; or than a *Mind*, or *Thought*, or the finest *No-tion* can be painted or carv'd. And consequently Man could not be made after GOD's *Essence*, but only according to that *Image* which he was pleas'd to take unto Himself.

And does not the account we have of Man's Formation hint as much ? For it being resolv'd by the Almighty Creator, that Man should be made in his *Image*, and after his *Likeness* ; how did he proceed in that great (and to *us* important) Work ? It is said, *Gen. 2. 7. The LORD GOD formed Man of the Dust of the Ground*. Where note, that as Man was made *half* of Dust, *that half* of him was so considerable as to be stiled *Man* by his Creator, and so of necessity must bear *part of his Image* at least ; else one half of Man's *Compositum* or *Person* must be *without* it. Tho' so far as GOD's *Image* is *born by*
G 3 *that,*

86 *An Antidote against Arianism.*

that, it must be *corporeal*, it being capable of no other. But when of the low Material *Dust*, GOD had fram'd and fashioned the *Body* of Man, in all its Parts, and Organs, and Features ; then He *breathed into his Nostrils the Breath of Life* : that is, his *Soul*. But she being a *SPIRIT*, and capable of no Figure, could bear no *figurative Image* of GOD ; which therefore must still rest upon his *Body*. And so Man's *Body* must be made after GOD's ; after that *Body* which He thought fit to put on, and appear in to his *Creatures*.

2dly. *It excuses the HOLY GHOST from vain Repetitions.* Whereas otherwise He must speak the same thing in *two* Synonymous Words, and so *one* must be *superfluous*. But if we allow, *after our Likeness*, to express Man's *Spiritual*, and *Moral* Resemblance of GOD ; and *in our Image*, to express the Representation of his chosen *Shape* or *Bodily Figure* ; both the terms will be proper, and of useful Signification. But unless we admit *that*, we must own the *SPIRIT* useth *Tautology* : which without indecency we can't impute to Him, especially in so very compendious an account as that of the *Cosmopœia*, or *Creation* is.

Yet the better to clear up what here is said, let me subjoin. That *Image*, and *Similitude* are not Terms convertible. They signify different things. For tho' every
Image

Image is a *Similitude*, yet every *Similitude* is not an *Image*. And therefore tho' the Soul of Man might very well bear GOD's *Similitude*; which she really does if she be but *qualitercunq*; *similis*, like Him any way or manner; (as she is in several respects:) yet *Iselem*, importing GOD's corporeal Image (as has been suggested) that can be only in his *Body*; and there it may be properly seated.

3dly. It gives a most probable Account of the Occasion of the Angels Fall. For when they saw so mean a Creature as Man (made half of Dust) advanc'd to so high a Privilege as partaking of GOD's Image by wearing a *Body* of the same Figure with His; this might strangely shock and disturb them. For thus they saw him stamp'd with the most illustrious Signature; and crown'd with the most transcendent Glory which in the *Form* of their Being they could aspire to. And when they beheld One so inferior to themselves, whose *Body* was wholly from the Earth, and whose *abode* was to be upon it; rais'd so high in the Divine Favour; and themselves pass'd by who were of a much superior Order, and would have triumph'd in that rare Prerogative: this might move them to proud and scornfull Envy at their Fellow Creature; and perhaps to unworthy Thoughts of GOD, if not to rebellious Carriage against Him. And then no wonder that their sinking

G 4

ing deep in such hainous Sins, should be the cause of their woful Ruin.

4thly. It notably explains and inforces the Reason, which GOD Himself gives for the Punishment of wilful Murder. As the Crime is horrid, so the Punishment of it is heavy; no less than Capital by the irreversible Law of Heaven. *He that sheddeth Man's Blood, by Man shall his Blood be shed,* Gen. 6. 9. And why? the reason follows: *for in the Image of GOD made be Man.* So that if the Body of Man bears the Image of GOD; the Reason why a Murderer should die, is close, and clear, and very strong as well as just. For then by shedding Man's Blood he kills his Body; and by killing his Body, he directly and literally destroys GOD's Image. And he that does that, can't but greatly deserve to die; the Fact being no less than High Treason against the KING of Kings; as clipping, or melting down his Coin, is against an earthly Prince. To which Ignatius prettily alludes, where he calls Man *Νομισμα ἐπὶ ΘΕΟΥ χαρῆχθὲν*: *Money coin'd by GOD*; as being stamp't with His Image. But now supposing GOD's Image to be only in the Soul, and in Dominion over the Creatures, according to the common Hypothesis; (and in Man's Body it can no more be seated by that, than a King's Power can be in his Garment) how obscure and flat would *this Reason* for punishing Murder be? For then as the

the Soul is *Immortal* and not to be *Kill'd*; so GOD's *Image* would be *Immaterial*, and not to be *Defac'd*. And so as the *Reason* for the Murderer's Death would be less natural and evident; its *explication* would be more Difficult, and its *force* so very low and languid as to be of no Validity.

Nay, the truth is, if GOD's Image be only in the Soul, *destroying* that Image can be *no reason* at all for executing a good Man's Murderer. For his Soul dismiss'd from its Body, ascends directly to the higher State, where she shall be more like God than ever. And then to put him to death for *destroying* GOD's Image, when he was really instrumental to *improving* it; would be very incongruous if not unjust.

5thly. *It informs us that Angels receiv'd not worship from Men before the Incarnation.* That they did do so has been commonly thought, and Divines have been somewhat put to it to find out solid *Reasons* for it. But in all likelihood the Opinion was erroneous, and the Mistake arose from hence. As the Apparition of Angels in former times was pretty frequent; so when one Angel appear'd alone, and would not, or did not discover his Name; it might be the *Messiah*, or the *Angel of the Covenant* in Humane Shape. And if *He* appear'd never so often, and were as oft ador'd, there could be no Fault or *Sin* in that. And when *more* Angels ap-

appeared with Him, He being still the *Chief*, the Adorations might be accepted and approved as paid to *Him* only, to whom alone they were due. And however Men might direct their Adorations to Angels in CHRIST's Presence, they did never allow them to terminate on themselves; and had not the *Messiah* been amongst them, they would certainly have rejected them. A pregnant instance of as much we have in *Apoc.* 19. 10. and 22. 9. where St. *John* falling down at an Angel's Feet to worship Him, he forbade him strictly. *ὄρα μὴ* &c. *See thou do it not*: and then directed that he would adore *Him* that is, always *was*, and ever *shall* be the sole meet Object of religious Veneration; *worship GOD*.

Lastly. *It fairly interprets those Texts of Scripture, which attribute humane Parts to the ALMIGHTY. That* (as we have understood) *wasever done ἀνθρώπου παθῶς*, in way of condescension to our weakness. And so in an allusive manner, or figurative sense only we took GOD to have *Face, Eyes, Arms, Hands, Feet, &c.* But according to the Notion I am now upon, the Texts speaking thus, and relating to GOD; will be *literally* true, and need not be thought *Metaphorical* in the least.

And besides taking off the harshness of Scripture Passages, by restoring them to their proper Meaning, this will clear *Anthropomorphites*

phites from their reputed Errors. And tho' they were condemn'd for *Hereticks* because they attributed humane Shape to GOD; yet what they said of Him that way, will thus appear to be Sound and *Orthodox*. For as GOD the SON did not only appear in an humane Body, but was incarnate, born, lived, and died in the same; and after it was dead, and bury'd, resum'd and rose with it on the third Day: so it is manifest, that GOD the FATHER *wears* a glorious Body of the humane Shape. Let none therefore so mistake the Notion I am upon, or offer to misrepresent it; as to think, or say, that I suppose the FATHER was *Personally joined* to a Body. Tho' that were never done, he might yet appear in a *Bodily Shape*, *when*, and *where*, and *how* he pleased. For making a corporeal Appearance a Symbol of his Special *Presence*; and assuming a Body, into hypostatical *Union* with Himself (as His eternal SON did our Nature;) are Dispensations vastly different, and so the one can't imply the other.

These are a Specimen of those *Reasons* which may incline us to think that the *Body* of Man was *Originally* made after the *Image* of GOD: after that *corporeal Image* of *his* which He chose to represent Himself to his Creatures in, and according to the Features and Lineaments of which he was pleas'd to form *Adam's*, and consequently to fashion ours.

And

92 *An Antidote against Arianism.*

And here let me add, which must be matter of high Satisfaction to the *Good*, that all who are so, shall rise at last with Bodies in *that Image*, or of *that Figure*; and shall retain the same for ever. So we are assur'd, 1 Cor. 15. 49. *As we have born the Image of the Earthly, we shall bear the Image of the Heavenly Adam.* And besides that *Image* imports *Body*, a *Bodily Image* must there be meant, because the Chapter runs upon the *Body's Resurrection* so much, and upon clearing it up. Now the *Image* of the first *Adam* the *Protoplast*, we carry sufficiently in its *Figure*; and therefore the *Image* of the second *Adam* *CHRIST*, we may hope to bear as fully in that respect. Nay, we may boldly expect that a most valuable Addition shall be made to it. For our Dear *LORD* has expressly promis'd, that our *vile Body*, by His Almighty Power shall be fashion'd like to His Glorious *Body*, Phil. 3. 21. Like to it, that is, not in *Figure* only, but also in *Splendor*: and therefore says the *Interlineary Gloss*, *assimilabimur Corpori Illius in claritate quam habuit in Transfiguratione: We shall be made like to His Body in the Brightness which it had at the Transfiguration.* And then as we read, St. Mat. 17. 2. *His Face did shine as the Sun.* And should any enquire, when shall we be thus Glorious? I answer, the Time when this shall be, is pointed at directly, Act. 3. 19. when *και οὐ ἀναψυχας*, the times of

of Re-animation come, or the time for reducing Souls into their Bodies to reinliven them. Then, in that very juncture it is, that all pure and holy Souls shall put on eternally glorious Bodies, in figure like to GOD's own Body.

But from the *Image* of GOD wherewith Man is graced, these *two* short *Inferences* naturally result.

1st. We bearing GOD's *Image* now, and expecting to do it in fairer Measures for ever; *how should we be pleas'd with the thoughts of that Privilege we now enjoy; and with expectation of its approaching endless Improvements.* Surely the Royal Prophet did so, which made him exclaim (and perhaps with Exultancy) *I shall be satisfy'd when I awake* תשננה *with thine Image, Psal. 17. ult.* When he shall awake, that is, and rise from the Dead, with a glorious Body conform to GOD's. And so the *first* Inference looks forward with a chearful air.

But the *Second* has a retrospect as low'ring and melancholy. *When our first Parents apostatiz'd from GOD, what a dismal aggravation was this of their Guilt?* For in case they knew that GOD had adorn'd their Bodies with his *Image*, what horrid Baseness must there be in their Sin? Yet know it they very well might. For when this World was made, as WISDOM, or the SON of GOD says, that *He rejoiced in the habitable Parts*
of

of the Earth, and had his delights with the SONS of Men, Prov. 8. 31: so we need not question, but he took singular delight in our first Parents when they were innocent. And when GOD constantly walked in Paradise in the cool of the Day, Gen. 3. 8; it might be to solace Himself with that new made, and new married Couple, as spotless, as on Earth they were peerless. And which soever of the HOLY THREE conversed with them in His Bodily Form, they might soon perceive and easily observe, that their own Bodies were like to His. And when they thus discern'd themselves so gloriously distinguished from other Creatures, and by that Distinction so exalted above them; this could not but mightily inhanche their Trespasse. O let us make that Image of GOD which aggravated their Sin; a Guard and Fence, or Bulwark against ours: I mean by making us to live the more purely.

I now conclude the long Exposition of this *Article* with the following *Observation*. *That GOD in Moses his time, and ever since, did always afford his special Presence to his Church on Earth, in some visible Sign, or Token of it. Not but that He might at all times be so present to his Church before. For when Cain withdrew from the Church, it is said, Gen. 4. 16. That he went out from the Presence of the LORD. Which may intimate, that he remov'd from that place where*

where GOD did *visibly manifest his Residence*. And *one* clear instance of that *Manifestation*, might be *the Fire from Heaven*, which seems to have descended very constantly to consume all Oblations of that Nature which GOD *accepted*. And therefore when *Cain* and *Abel* brought their respective Offerings, and the celestial Flame devour'd the *one*, but never touch'd the *other*; this made it evident which was approv'd, and which was not. And that this lively Token of the Divine Presence so solemnly discriminative, did not continue to the End of *that* World, and reach to the *next*; who can say?

But whether that were so or not, this we know; that after *Moses* had conducted *Israel* out of *Egypt* into the Wilderness: there they had the Symbols of GOD's Presence with them openly. That is, the Pillar of a Cloud by Day; and a Pillar of Fire by Night. And when they settled in the Promis'd Land, as they had the Symbols of, the same GOD's Presence in the *Tabernacle*; so when *Solomon* had built his Temple, he remov'd the ARK into the holiest Place of it, when that was dedicated. And then as we find, in 1 *Kin.8.* *A Cloud filled the House*. And that Cloud was a *glorious* one too, for by reason of its Glory the Priests could not stand to minister there. And so what could that be but a stately Παράστασις, or Representation of
GOD

GOD the FATHER? For as (a) *Josephus* relates, when that Cloud fell into the Sanctuary, every Man presently thought, and was confirm'd in his Opinion that GOD *came down into it to dwell there.* And, indeed what properer ὑποτύπωσις, or more apposit Emblem of his adorable MAJESTY could there be in that Juncture? For as the Church was then under the *Mosaick Dispensation* which consisted mainly of Types and Shadows, and in its constitution was *cloudy* and obscure: so that the Token of His Presence with the *Jews*, might correspond to the *Quality* of their Worship; between the Cherubim in their Temple he dwelt in the Likeness of a *Cloud*, to the end of their Polity.

But then if by such a *Shechinah*, or Habitation (which is commonly render'd THE DIVINITY IT SELF, and often in the *Targum*, the MAJESTICK PRESENCE) GOD the FATHER did dwell symbolically upon Earth: why may he not exhibit Himself answerably in Heaven, where He most especially resides?

And as to the *Jews*, a *Cloud* in their Temple was the *Token* of GOD's special Presence; so to us *Christians* he gave his only SON, Who being incarnate in our Flesh dwelt a-

(a) Antiq. li. 8. cap. 2.

bove thirty Years upon Earth. And when from hence He ascended to Heaven, he left the *Sacramental Symbols* behind Him ; which are not only *Indications* of the Divine *Residence* with us ; but also *Signs* of great *benefits*, and *means* or instruments of *conveighing* them to us. And when the Great GOD thus condescends to us in this *Present State* ; why may he not do the like in the *Future* ; and dwell there in some *Form*, not only conspicuous, but exceeding Glorious, and so agreeable to Himself ?

And truly for His doing so, there seems to be *good reason* ; for otherwise *none of his Creatures can ever see Him*. And would it not be a very damping thought, even in Heaven it self, that we should never, never see the GOD who brought us thither. Suppose a good Father had bred up his Children well, and besides being tender and carefull of them, had made so ample Provision for them, as that they might live most splendidly together. Now should they dwell continually where this Father is (in the same Court, allowing him to be a King ;) and never see him : would it not be a sore grief to them ? But then what sadness might it occasion us *above*, to think we should never see our Heavenly FATHER there, who exalted us to the Glories and Felicities of that State ?

H

Should

Should it be demanded, what would it avail us to see GOD in a *Body*, when by that, we should discern never the more of His SPIRIT, or Essence? I might answer; Pray, what do Children see more than the *Bodies* of their best Parents here? Yet what *singular* satisfaction results from their seeing and conversing with them? And the very same, tho' of an higher Nature, and in better Measures shall *they* perceive in the Celestial Mansions, who there *behold* GOD in His glorious Body. Tho' indeed were he not in a Body, He could not be seen of us at all. Nor of any *Angels* neither; Tho' we know what the *Learned* teach. Namely, that naked Spirits may not only see one another, but by *Intuition* can mutually understand each others *Minds*. A pretty Notion of the *Schools*, and of the right and genuine Strain for odd Extravagances.

But I must note farther. That the Saints shall see GOD in the Regions above, is so far believ'd, that the *Blessedness* there is grounded upon, and is thought to proceed from that glorious Sight; and therefore 'tis call'd the *Beatifick Vision*. But then GOD being a SPIRIT, and so *invisible*; to raise our Beatitude he will shew himself to us above in some *magnificent Appearance*. But then that Appearance being to be seen, as it must be *visible*, so its Visibility speaks it *corporeal*, and that again supposes it to be of some

some Shape. And then if any *one Image* would be more *conducive* to the Saints future Blifs, and *perfective of it* than another; (considering GOD's wonderful love and value for Mankind) we may reasonably conclude it should certainly be *that*. And then it must be the *Humane Figure*, that being most proper and useful to render the Saints most Blessed for ever. For whence can higher and sweeter Blifs flow in at our Eyes? and what can possibly be more taking and ravishing than for us to behold GOD in *our Form*, in *his own Kingdom* for ever? Especially when so long as the FATHER dwells there in our *Figure*; his Eternal SON shall do it in our *Nature*. And this *Image* of GOD's being a standing Mark of high *Honour to us*, and of as signal *Favour and Dignity from Him*; our free beholding it must needs fill our Souls, with the most exquisitely delicious Joys and Pleasures that they are capable of. O blessed Spectators that may gaze upon it as they please, with Eyes suited to its inconceivable Glories!

ARTICLE VI.

The FATHER Uncreate, the SON Uncreate, and the HOLY. GHOST Uncreate.

EXPOSITION.

The Writer of this Creed having plainly and piously set forth the HOLY TRINITY in UNITY; the Three PERSONS in the GODHEAD; their equal GLORY and MAJESTY; with the IDENTITY of their Nature: instead of insisting at all nicely on the *way* or *manner* of their subsisting in the DEITY (where Divine *Modes* are unsearchable :) he wisely goes next upon certain *Attributes* common to them all, and of mighty force to prove their DIVINITY.

And here he makes a discreet choice of *Four Properties*, which shew Their *Independence*, *Immensify*, *Eternity*, and *Omnipotence*. Which being High and Mighty Attributes, do best exhibit their absolute Sovereignty, and incomparable Excellency.

The First Attribute is *Uncreate*. And well might that lead the van, as being fittest to do it in reference to the PERSONS nam'd in the Article. Because They all being GOD, of necessity they must be *Uncreate*. For had
GOD

GOD been *Created*, then for certain once He *was not* : and if ever He *were not*, then 'tis as certain He could never *have been*. For who should have *made Him* ? Not any Creatures, for before they were He produc'd *them all*. Nor could He *make Himself*, for then he had no Being, and so no Power or Capacity to do the least Act ; and much less that of *Creation*, especially of *Himself*.

Besides ; a Created GOD is a plain Contradiction, and perfect Non sense. A Notion like that of a square Circle, or a round Triangle ; things inconsistent and impossible.

GOD is a Being Infinitely Perfect (and therefore no Creature can be a GOD) and infinite Perfection includes infinite Existence. Existence, that is, without Beginning, and without End ; which is incompatible to one Created. This therefore may be laid down as a standing *Maxim*, or undeniable Proposition : that *none can be truly GOD but He who is compleatly Eternal*. And I can't but ask, what Man of any Wit or Learning, would not be asham'd to own *Him* for a GOD, who must *die* in the end, live he never so long ? But then the same Person may think if it be not as disgraceful and diminishing an Imperfection, and every whit as repugnant to a DEITY ; not to have lived *from Eternity*, as it is to *die at last* ? The Christians GOD therefore as he has *no End*

of *LIFE*; so according to the suitable Term here, he was *Uncreate*, or *without Beginning of Days*.

And what is thus pronounc'd of the *FATHER*, is as true of the *SON*, and *HOLY GHOST*. FOR the *SON* being *begotten* by the *FATHER*, and the *HOLY GHOST* *proceeding* from Him, and the *SON*; They must both be as *Uncreate* as the *FATHER* is.

ARTICLE VII.

The *FATHER* Incomprehensible, the *SON* Incomprehensible, and the *HOLY GHOST* Incomprehensible.

EXPOSITION.

As *GOD* in Existence antedates all time so in his Essence he exceeds all Bounds: and as he was Eternally *before* all Worlds, so he is as Infinitely *beyond* them. And this is true of all the *DIVINE PERSONS*.

First, of the *FATHER*. For He is not only a *GOD* at hand, but a *GOD* afar off, Jer. 23. 23. And well may he be so, when as we read in the next verse. he *fills* not only the *Earth*, but *Heaven* also. Nay, he does

does not only fill Heaven, but *the Heaven of Heavens is not able to contain him*, 1 King. 8. 27. And indeed how can it when *he sets His Glory above the Heavens*, Psal. 8 1.

So that in short, GOD's Essential Presence is every where at once, so far as Ubiety can be attributed to a Spirit. And tho' it can be contained in no place, yet it can be *shut out* of none neither. Of this Presence we read thus in the 139th Psalm. *Whither shall I go from Thy Presence? If I ascend up into Heaven, Thou art there. If I make my Bed in Hell, behold, Thou art there. If I take the wings of the Morning, and dwell in the uttermost parts of the Sea; even there shall thy hand lead me, and Thy right hand shall hold me.* From which holy Queries and Assertions it appears, that the Essence of GOD is universally spread thro' all places; and how can it be otherwise when it is infinitely expanded by an ubiquitary or illimited Amplitude? And thus at once it is above all Height, below all Depth, and beyond all Latitude that Nature has; and we can no where be distant from Him. And is it not happy for us that we cannot? For could we by any migration or remove, be conveyed out of GOD's Presence, we must be shifted into *nothing*. For how could we subsist one moment where GOD is not? nor his Manutenency to hold us in Being?

In this Point the Doctrine of *Mahomet* fairly falls in with that of *CHRIST*. For in the 15th Chapter of the *Alcoran* he brings in *GOD* speaking thus. *We created Man without difficulty, we know the motions of his Soul, and penetrate into his Heart, as his Blood into the Veins of his Body.* And in the 58th Chapter, concerning *GOD*, he teaches as followeth. *If ye be three secretly met together, he is the fourth. If ye be five, he is the sixth. If ye be more or fewer, he is always with you.* A plain attestation of *GOD's Ubiquity*, which implies He is *Incomprehensible*.

Secondly, this is true of the *SON* also. His own Words prove it, *S. John 3. 13. No Man hath ascended up to Heaven, but he that came down from Heaven, the SON of Man who is in Heaven.* That *CHRIST's Humanity* præexisted, and liv'd very long before he was Born; is no uncommon Doctrine with the Christian Fathers. And then it was that he *ascended* up to Heaven, and dwelt there. But when he descended to be incarnate, he as really *came down* from Heaven again. Tho' even then when he was upon Earth, he call'd Himself *the SON of Man which is in Heaven.* And he that could be in Heaven when he was upon Earth, might certainly be *any where*, and also *every where* as well; and so must be *Incomprehensible*. Can any *Man*, or any *Angel*, or any *Creature* be in two distant Places at once? Upon the Earth, and in Hea-

Heaven at the same time? Yet thus it was with the LORD CHRIST, as he told the *Jews*; an irrefragable Proof of his *Incomprehensibleness*. For what can contain that PERSON, whom the vast Heavens indefinitely extended, can't circumscribe? To pretend to baffle the Instance, by saying, He ascended *to Heaven*, and was *in it*, by way of *Conversation* (as good Christians are, *Phil. 1. 20.*) would be vain and impertinent. The very *Words* will admit of no such sense. For they are spoken *of*, and point directly *at* CHRIST's *Presence*, not his *Conversation*. Besides, if he ascended to Heaven, and were in it only *in way of Conversation*; then his descent, or coming down from thence, must have been sinking *below* a virtuous and holy Life; which he could not be guilty of.

And then that the HOLY GHOST is *Incomprehensible*, is very manifest from *Psal. 139. 7.* *Whither shall I go from Thy Spirit? or whither shall I go from Thy Presence?* Which plainly signifies, that to go from GOD's SPIRIT, is as *impossible*, as it is to go from his *Presence*. And so one in Imensity is equal to the other, and both must be alike *Incomprehensible*.

ARTICLE VIII.

The FATHER is Eternal, the SON Eternal, and the HOLY GHOST Eternal.

EXPOSITION.

As to the FATHER's Eternity it was hinted plainly if not prov'd already. See *Exposit. of Artic. VI.* To that therefore I add but this. The FATHER's Essence is as lasting as it is boundless; and as infinite in Duration, as in Expansion. He had no Beginning, nor shall He have an End. He existed before Time was, and He continues thro' all Eternity; and could that terminate or expire, He would not fail to live beyond it. Endless Being is as essential to *Him*, as Roundness to a Circle, and every whit as inseparable from Him.

That the SON is Eternal, is evident from *Isai. 9. 6.* where he is said to be (a) *the Father of Eternity*; or (b) *the Author of it.* For the Hebrew Word signifies both. And he that is the Parent or Source of Eternity, must of

(a) אבִי עֵד

(b) *Pater*, more Hebræo, dicitur autor ejusque rei.

Fater.

necessity be Eternal himself; or else the Effect must be before the Cause. And tho' the *Seventy* render those words (c) *the Father of the Age to come*: Yet that no more hinders his being the *FATHER of Eternity*, than a Man's living an hundred Years, hinders him from living as many Minutes after that. And truly to the great Shame of many learned *Christians*, and *Divines*; I may prove our *LORD's Divinity* as well as his *Eternity*, By remarkable Words of an Heathen Philosopher. I mean *Amelius*, who said, ἔτερον ἄρα ἦν ὁ Λόγος, καθ' οὗ αἰεὶ ἔντα, τὰ γινώμενα ἐγένετο. *This was the Word by whom existing always, all things were made.* And then he affirms, περὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ εἶναι, καὶ Θεὸν εἶναι: *that he was with GOD, and was GOD.* Vid. *Euseb. Pr. Ev. l. 11. cap. 9.*

And then the *HOLY GHOST* must be *Eternal* too. So He is expressly call'd, *Heb. 9. 14. the Eternal SPIRIT.* And why should not *CHRIST*, as well offer up Himself by that *HOLY SPIRIT*, (which he is there said to do) as by him (d) *he was led into the Wilderiness to be tempted*; and as by him (e) *he cast out Devils*; and as (f) *he was*

(c) Πατὴρ τῷ μέλλοντι αἰῶνι.

(d) Mat. 4. 1.

(e) Ib. 12. 28.

(f) Acts 10. 38.

anointed with him ? And truly why was he Anointed with his *Power*, but to act by his *Impulse* ? Not that the HOLY GHOST at his *Passion* interfer'd with Him in his *Office* ; for as he was both our *Sacrifice* and *High-Priest*, so as he *was* the *one*, he *offer'd* up the *other*. Yet as in his *Agony* he was comforted by an Angel ; so by the Eternal SPIRIT he might be *influenc'd* on the Cross. This is suggested in proof that by the *Eternal* SPIRIT mention'd, is meant the Third PERSON in the DEITY.

The HOLY GHOST also *Proceedeth from the FATHER*, as the Evangelist teacheth, and so as *His*, he must be as *Eternal* as Himself. Nor in *reason* can he be otherwise. For if every one of the FATHER's *Properties* naturally in Him be *Eternal*, as they certainly are ; how can His SPIRIT who naturally proceeds *from* Him possibly be otherwise ?

ARTICLE IX.

And yet they are not Three Eternals, but One Eternal.

As also there are not Three Incomprehensibles, nor Three Uncreated; but One Incomprehensible, and One Uncreated.

EXPOSITION.

Tho' there be Three Uncreate, that is, and Three Incomprehensible, and Three Eternal LIVES, or PERSONS; yet there is but One Uncreate, and one Incomprehensible, and One Eternal GOD. For none can think the Composer of this Creed so void of Reason, as to affirm that Three are not Three; or that *Three* are *One* in the same respect. But where he says the Three are *Uncreate, Incomprehensible and Eternal*; and goes on asserting them to be *Almighty*, and to be GOD, and to be LORD: he only means that the Divine PERSONS are Three distinctly under those several Denominations, and yet *Essentially* but *One* GOD. The Sense of this *Article* is so obvious and easy, that it needs no farther Explication. Here then there being *room* for it, before I proceed

ceed farther, it will not be amiss to offer somewhat in *Vindication* of that Writer to whom this *Creed* is owing, whether the Person be *Athanasius* or not. For many are too apt to censure him for some *Passages* (such as I'm now enter'd upon) as if they were vain and needless, or worse. But let such know, that how little soever they *make* the Man, or how much soever they *depreciate* or *avile* him; yet what he deliver'd in this weighty case, was done with serious, if not *nicest* regard to the great End he aim'd at. And if rightly weigh'd, will appear to be laudably fitted to promote and accomplish the same. For his *Scope* and *Work* was to draw up a Summary, or compendious System of the Christian Faith. And so it must consist of the chief or fundamental Articles of their Religion. And the principal Article of that Religion being the HOLY TRINITY in UNITY (about which, before, and at that time there were very hot Contests, and had been high and fierce Disputes;) and it being to be brought down as far as it could be, to the Capacity of the meanest, and also to be inculcated as far as might be into their *Memories* as well as *Understandings*: from hence came the necessity of this good Man's doing what here he did. This forc'd him to be so *full*, and very *distinct*; and constrain'd him to *set home* some momentous Points even by *repeating* them.

And

An Antidote against Arianism. 111

And it being his purpose to *drive them* into the *Minds* of the *unlearned*, and to *imprint* them the deeper there when enter'd; how could he do it by a properer Method? And therefore the clauses which some condemn as *superfluous*, may be fairly excused. For they are no vain strokes of a licentious Pen, that ran riot in empty and heedless Tautologies; but really kind and condescensive Expressions of study'd plainness, adapted to such ordinary Christians as are less acute, and of low apprehension. And so the Particularities I have heard reflected on as vain and needless; are not so mighty culpable. They are most of them requisite rather, and very laudable, as being of use to the *Vulgar* sort to lead them into Knowledge of the Glorious TRIAD, as to them they are suitably explanatory of it. Particularly, where he asserts, *there are not three GODS, but one GOD*; and *there are not three LORDS, but one LORD*. For tho' none ever maintain'd there were *three* distinct true GODS, or *three* different real LORDS; yet it was but a prudent Caveat to the *meaner*, and *younger* sort, not to think there are *three* GODS, or *three* LORDS, because he positively (tho' rightly) affirm'd before the *first* Expression, that *the FATHER is GOD, the SON is GOD, and the HOLY GHOST is GOD*: and before the *Second*, *the FATHER is LORD, the SON LORD, and the HOLY GHOST LORD*.
And

And therefore had not he who drew up this Creed, wisely and charitably stoop'd thus low in explicating the High Article of the TRINITY; he could not have open'd and illustrated it so clearly to *common Believers*. And so instead of Censure here, he merits Praise; as proceeding in a weighty case with needful Caution: what he wrote touching the TRINITY, being as full of care and Christian Prudence, as it was of Orthodox Instruction. He that treats of Fundamentals in Religion, or delivers nothing else; ought to speak plainly rather than finely: and to make his Stile familiar and intelligible, tho' it be the less quaint and curious. And if in this Tract I have taken measures *some-what* like these, and besides speaking as plainly as I could, have *repeated* some *weighty Passages*; I would not have this imputed to carelessness, but to the desire I had to help the meaner sort, and to facilitate their *apprehension* of *useful* things, and also their *Remembrance* of them.

ARTICLE X.

So likewise the FATHER is Almighty, the SON Almighty, and the HOLY GHOST Almighty.

And yet they are not Three Almighties, but One Almighty.

EXPOSITION.

The Fourth Attribute here given to the Divine PERSONS, is *Omnipotence*. And most justly is it ascribed to them, as being for certain actually *in* them; as may soon be prov'd.

That the FATHER is Almighty, appears from his being so called near *sixty times* in the *Old Testament*. And then besides his being styl'd so, *frequently* in the *New*; his Title in the Three famous *Creeeds* containing the Catholick Doctrine which Christians profess; is *GOD the FATHER* Almighty. And none that own His DEITY, can deny that Property.

And then that the SON and the HOLY GHOST both are as *Almighty* as Himself; is manifest from *Psal. 33. 6. By the WORD of the LORD were the Heavens made, and all the Host of them by the BREATH of his Mouth.*

Which divine Sentence plainly evidenceth the SON and HOLY GHOST to be *Almighty*. For the WORD of the LORD there mention'd, is no other than the *Hypostatick* WORD ; or that SON of GOD, which St. *John* calls the WORD, and vouches that *all things were made by him*. And then by the SPIRIT of GOD's Mouth, is meant the PERSON of the HOLY GHOST ; by whose Creative Power in Conjunction with the FATHER's and the SON's, the Celestial Hosts were brought into Being. Yet he was no more a real *Breath* of GOD's like ours ; than GOD has a real *Mouth* like one of us.

Now when by this WORD, and SPIRIT of JEHOVAH (as the FATHER is call'd *thirteen* times in that *Psalms*) the Heavens were made, and all the Host of them ; not only their *Material* Host, Sun, Moon, Stars, and Comets ; but their *Spiritual* Host too, even all Angels : how can the WORD and SPIRIT that made them, be less than *Almighty* ? For what but Almighty Power could so far overcome *nothing*, that infinite *Vacuity* of Being, or *Incapacity* for it ; as out of it to have brought the least Crumb of Earth, or the minutest *Creature* under Heaven ? But how then could This WORD and SPIRIT unless They were *Almighty*, ever have made the Host of *Luminaries* ? much less the Host of Blessed *Angels* the most Glorious Beings next to their Maker in the Universe ?

verse? When the Ancients therefore by this Text (which they used much to that purpose) would prove the TRINITY; they argu'd from no improper Topick. For who could Create such a World as the *Universe* is, with such variety of admirable Beings, as furnish, adorn, and inhabit it; but GOD alone? And so as many as were *Efficients* in that mighty Work, as they must have a Divine Power, so they must be of a Divine Nature, and consequently Divine PERSONS.

But to invalidate this Argument of *Creation*, which proves the DEITY of the Three Sacred PERSONS; should any alledge that the Universe came not into being by GOD's *Creating* it, but by *Emanation* from Himself: I should answer thus.

1st. That *the World must then have been Eternal*. For in case of *Emanative Efficiency*, posita Causa ponitur Effectus: *the meer Existence of the Cause immediately and necessarily produces its Effect*. And then all the Arguments brought against that vain Opinion of the World's Eternity will confute this Allegation.

2^{dly}. *The Hypothesis is impossible*. For then a *Material Substance* must flow directly from a *Spiritual* one; which it can never do. No one Substance can so issue from another without being homogeneous with it. And the reason's clear, because it flows from its

very Effence, and is a *congenial* Emission of the same. Thus, a substantial Emanation from Fire must be Fire ; and the like from Air must be Air. For look what the *Substance* of any thing is, and none of its natural *Substantial Effluxes* can differ from its own Being. But then when one Substance thus flows from another, if it must be *connatural* with it ; then the World by flowing thus from GOD, must be a *Spiritual* World, as coming by immediate Emanation from a *Spirit*. And truly without its issuing *so* from Him, neither He could be an *emanative Cause* of *that* ; nor that an *emanative Effect* of His. But then it must have been a *Spiritual World*, I say, because where one Substance emerges out of another as the *Emanative Cause* of it ; the *Effect* can be but a Substance processive from the Substance of that Cause. And such an *Efflux* must be connatural with its *Source* ; else the Substance in the *Effect* will not be of the same *Nature* with that in the *Cause* ; tho' *Logical* Terms make no *Physical* difference in things.

Yet then at last this *Material* World could no more issue from GOD's Effence immediately, which is *Spiritual* ; than the Glorious Sun can shine forth Darkness ; or Fire send forth freezing Coldness. For between Fire and Frost, and the Sun and Darkness there is no greater Difference ; than there is between GOD and Matter in Substance and

Con-

Consistency. And He having *no Matter* at all in Him, *from* him none could *emanatively* come. For in case of Substantial Emanation (*which must be here*) the Efflux *from* a Being, must be an Efflux of it too: even its own proper Substance flushing out into farther Expansion of it self. And then GOD's Essence being *Spiritual*, how could this World be *emanative* from it, when 'tis *Elementary* or *Corporeal*? Nothing can so come from GOD which never *was*, nor *can be in* Him, I mean in his Nature.

But tho' these PERSONS made the Heavens and their Hosts; yet how came they to be *Almighty*? Or what inabled them to do *omnipotent Acts*, when they were but LIFES? I answer.

1st. *Life seems to be the chief Source of all that Strength*, (that *Active Strength*) *which any Living Being has*. And so according to the *Kinds of Life*, and the *Native force* or vigour of them; *such is the Power* of those *Beings* which are actuated by them. Answerable, I mean, to those *Vital Principles*, or those different *Qualities* or *Degrees* of Life which *quicken* them. And consequently as Beings were regularly made of an *higher* or *lower Rank*; and as Life in them was of an *higher* or *lower Nature*; *Sensitive*, *Rational*, or *Divine*: so their respective *Strengths* corresponded thereto pretty much.

118 *An Antidote against Arianism.*

As to *Sensitive Life*, it spreads, thro' many *Species* of Animals. And they being of sundry *Kinds*, their *Lives* must be of as several *Sorts*, and their Bulks, or Magnitudes of sundry *Sizes*, and so their Strengths of suitable *Degrees*. But if in any one *Species* there be some *Individuals* stronger than others; that must be owing to the Goodness of their Blood or Spirits, to their sound and hail Constitution, to the frame of their Organs, the Make of their Limbs, the Vegeteness of their Bodies, or to some extraordinary *Corporal* Advantages which they enjoy above the rest of their Rank.

And then, secondly, as to *Rational Beings*, *sublimar Life*, in them is plainly attended with greater proportionable *Strength*. Thus *Angels* having a Principle of Life superior to *ours*; upon that account they are much stronger than *we*. And therefore as for their prevailing Might. (a) *Angels that excel in Strength*, is their Character in the Old Testament: so in the New, they are said to be (b) *Angels of his* (that is, of GOD's) *Power*; as sharing more deeply in that Perfection than any other Creatures, by virtue of their *Diviner Life*.

Should it here be suggested that *the Rule given Fails*, and even in reference to Man-

(a) Psal. 103. 20.

(b) ἄγγελοι δυνάμεως ἁγῆς, 2 Thes. 1. 7.

kind; for tho' they be happy in *Rational Life*, many Brutes which have but the *Sensitive* one, exceed them in *Strength*: to that I must answer thus. *There is too good Reason for it.* When GOD first created Man, who knows what his *natural Strength* was? This we are sure of, that He then vested him in *Universal Empire* over all Sublunary Animals. A good sign that his strength was then more suitable to his Sovereignty, than now it is. And in *Genesis* 1. 28. we see his Patent or *Commission* for Rule: *have Dominion over the Fish of the Sea, over the Fowl of the Air, and over every thing living that moveth upon the Earth.* And where GOD by his Word settles any *Blessing* or *Privilege* on Man, He gives *more* than he promises, rather than *less*. And then as this promis'd Dominion imply'd *Power*, so his Power might be *such* as by virtue of that and his innate *Lordliness*, to keep the terriblest Creatures under. So that not only *single Lions, Bears, Wolves*, or the like, but even *Multitudes* of them would have dreaded one Man, and fled from him, as from their formidable Lord and Master. For such mighty *Force* as well as stern Aspect and awfull *Majesty* would they have perceived in Him; that nothing would have been more dreadfull to them than his feared Presence, or the Accents of his Displeasure.

Thus probably it would have been with Man still had he retain'd his *Innocence*, and

persisted in his primitive *Integrity*. Then all those *Subjects* which the Sovereign of the World had given him, would always have obey'd him, and yielded due submission to him as to their Puissant Emperor. But Man alas ! soon apostatiz'd from his Maker, and rebell'd against him. And when *he* fell from GOD, his *Power* fell from *him*. And thus the Original Strength of his Nature was so weaken'd by his Sin ; that the *Rational Life* in him was no longer attended with that *regular Degree* of Strength and Dominion which should have been complicated with it. And no wonder, when his very *Nature* it self by that shock which his Rebellion gave it, was strangely shatter'd and degraded. And therefore if the *Rational Life in Man*, be now accompany'd with *less Strength* than otherwise he might have enjoy'd and exerted: that's owing neither to *Providence*, nor *Nature*, but to the folly and rashness of our *first Parents*. For they degenerating by Immorality, it brought such *Weakness* upon the humane Constitution, as sunk it below its Primitive force : nor shall the clogg of Imbecillity which Sin hang'd upon it, be ever taken off in this World. Not that I think (by the way) that if Man had retain'd his *Integrity*, he should have been stronger than an *Elephant*, or a *Whale* ; but then he should have carried *Grandeur* in his Countenance, and always have made so august a Figure,

gure, as would have struck such terror into Creatures about him; that even the mightiest, fiercest and most savage of all, would never have dar'd to rebel against him, or to offer any manner of violence to him. And because his natural Visage, and majestick Port, could cast such dread upon Animals; there was the less reason for his having Strength superior to theirs. For he could thus have curb'd, and daunted, and sway'd them strangely by his personal Stateliness, and presential Influence; had he continu'd innocent.

But then as to *Divinest Life* in GOD, That being *infinite*, in Him there must be *Infinite Strength* too; and so we know there is. For as the LORD is cloathed with Strength, *Psal.* 93. 1. And as in the LORD JEHOVAH is *Everlasting Strength*, *Isai.* 26. 4. so His Strength is as boundless in *Measure*, as it is in *Duration*. And well it may when His *Life* is so. Nor need it seem strange that Degrees of *Strength* should rise in Beings, according to their respective Degrees of *Life*. For do we not see? Impossible it is that any Creature should have the least natural *Motion*, or motive *Power*; till it has *Life* in it self. A clear indication that all *Strength* must flow from *Life*. And when Life in every Being is the Spring of all *Strength*, and spontaneous Motion, which results from it, and is its proper Effect: no
won-

122 *An Antidote against Arianism.*

wonder that the more a Creature has of *Life*, or the higher kind of *Life* it enjoys; it should have the more, or higher, active *Strength* too, naturally and regularly.

Tho' *how* the various sorts of *Lives* communicate different measures of *Strength*, unto divers *Kinds* of *Beings*; is too deep and dark a *Phænomenon* for *Mortals* to dive into and discover.

3dly. To the *Queries* I answer. The *Divine LIVES* might well be *Almighty*, and so able to perform the *Creative Acts* done by them. For they are not meer *naked*, or bare *abstracted LIVES*: But *LIVES* in an *Infinite Essence*. Nay, which is more, they are *Infinite LIVES* every one of which animates, or in his *particular way* quickens an *infinite Spirit*. Tho' the different *Mode* whereby each of them does it may well be *inexplicable*, when other *common Modes* are no less. And where any one *infinite LIFE* actuates an *infinite SPIRIT*, and illivens it; what can such a *LIFE* be less than *ALMIGHTY*? And what can be too hard for such an *Agent* to do, provided it consists with *Moral Purity*, and *Natural Regularity*; and so with *GOD's* infinite *GOODNESS*, and *WISDOM*?

ARTICLE XI.

So the FATHER is GOD, the SON is GOD, and the HOLY GHOST is GOD.

And yet they are not Three GODS, but One GOD.

EXPOSITION.

That the FATHER is GOD, is so plain a Truth to intelligent and thinking Christians, that if it be not *self-evident*, yet the bare right *Notion* of him implies or proves he is; or else demonstrates he *could never have been*. The true *Notion* of Him is, That he is of and from Himself. And therefore according to the Learned, He is *αὐτοῦν*, *self-existent*; *αὐτόζων*, *self-living*; *αὐτοαἶς*, *self-perpetual*; *αὐτοαὐτό*, *self-self*, as I may say: and all because He is *αὐτοθεός*, GOD of and from Himself. And he that is so, must needs be every way *infinitely Perfect*; and so truly GOD. For if *Self-Subsistence* is the *greatest Perfection* that can be, then He that has that must be *infinitely Perfect* every way; because from it all other Perfections naturally flow, or if they did not, that could raise them. And that the
peer-

124 *An Antidote against Arianism.*

peerless Power of absolute *Self-subsistence* is the very *highest Perfection of all*, is evident from hence : in that all the FATHER's Perfections, and his very *Essence* too, are *eternally from, and depend upon it*. And the FATHER truly must as certainly have been *Self-subsistent* from Eternity, and so infinitely perfect, and so GOD ; as it is sure the ~~World~~ *World is, or that we are*. For without his so Subsisting, not only the *World*, and *we*, but even the *Two other DIVINE PERSONS*, and HIS SELF, must intallibly have been *Eternal Nothing*. For who should have brought all into being but the Great GOD ? And how could *He* have *been* at all, and so have *done that*, if ever he were *not existent* ? For then who should have given being to *Him* when he was not ? or how could He have made Himself ? Most rightly therefore, may I call Him, in the language of *Jamblichus*, 'Αυτοπύτωρ *His own Father* ; and 'Αυτογονός, *Self-begotten*. Nor can I but much esteem, and also highly commend the *Orphean Theology* ; which long before made the supreme GOD *πρεσβύτατον*, *the oldest* of all Beings, and taught He was *αὐτοτελής* too, *self-perfect*. A thing not only *True* of GOD, but withal so absolutely *necessary*, that without it neither HE HIMSELF, nor consequently any other Being could ever have existed. And so what can *Atheism* be, but a stupid, nonsensical

senfical, phrantick Whimsy, springing up from a Sink of Ignorance?

But tho' *many* have *question'd* the FATHER's DEITY, yet *more* have shamefully *deny'd* the SONS, and stiffly *oppos'd* it. Indeed for sinful Men, and their eternal Benefit, 'tis known *He did*, and also *suffer'd* inexpressible things. But then for these ineffable favours how very strangely would *Numbers* requite Him! For having been incarnate in their Flesh to die for their Redemption, and to secure endless, and so even infinite Felicities to them; for this they would reduce him to their *own mean Rank*, and make *his* Nature the *same* with *theirs*. And when it is *thus*, surely true Love and Veneration to his MAJESTY should constrain *us* to oppose so great an *untruth*, as well as Indignity. For when denying CHRIST's DIVINITY is too *common* with *others*; for *us* to vindicate it we should think as *necessary*. For *us* I mean, of the sacred Function. For we being of his Family, or *Domesticks* to him (as we serve in his House, minister at his Table, and live, as it were, within the Veil;) who should have his Interest more at heart than *we*? and how careful should we be to maintain his just Honour, by asserting his *Divine Nature*?

But

But *how* shall *this* be best done? or *where* shall we find the most authentick Arguments to establish his DIVINITY? I answer, our Blessed LORD (who can best tell) points fairly at *this*, St. John 5. 39. *Search the Scriptures, — for they are they that testify of me.* So that the best *Testimonies* touching CHRIST, as to his *Natures*, PERSON, &c; and the clearest *Arguments* to make good the same; must be contain'd in the *Sacred Writings*. And tho' that Text sent the *Jews* to the *Old Testament* (which represented him figuratively in Types and Symbols) the *other* being not then extant: yet the *New Testament* being *now* promulgated, and that by CHRIST, and his inspir'd Emissaries; in all reason CHRISTIANS must have recourse to *that* (tho' not exclusively of the *other*) and may there find fairer Evidences and fuller Attestations of the *Messiah's* DEITY; which the *Article* I am upon asserts.

Let us take our REDEEMER's Counsel then, and search into those venerable Volumes which testify of Him. And if there it appears that in point of *Divinity* he is *commonly set upon the same Level with the FATHER* (bating his *Paternity*, which in *Order*, and *Relative Dignity* puts him before the SON;) must he not be GOD? Yet in those Books, our LORD the SON, is raised to *exact Parity* with the FATHER; waving the Considerations mention'd.

And

And so the *First* Argument to prove his DIVINITY shall be *this*. The Sacred Scripture plainly discovers it. For there the SPIRIT of Truth bestows the same *Epithets*, the very same upon CHRIST, that he does upon the SUPREME GOD. And must not his giving them *both* the same *Titles*, shew they are *both* of the same *Nature*? Yet this, I say, *he does very manifestly*, either in express Words, or in Terms equivalent: It shall be made good in undeniable Instances. Thus,

1. The Supreme GOD is said to be GOD the Creator. And is not as much said of CHRIST? For the SPIRIT declares that (e) *the WORD was GOD, and that all things were made by him; and without him was not any thing made, that was made*. And who was that WORD which *was* GOD, and made all things, but CHRIST?

2. The Supreme GOD is said to be the Invisible GOD. And so must CHRIST be, a Being so very like to GOD Himself. For as CHRIST is equal to GOD in other Perfections; so he is as to his *Invisible Nature*, where the Comparison here lies. Else he could not truly represent Him, or be *the exact Character of his Subsistence*, as he is affirm'd to be, *Heb. 1. 3*. Tho' when he is there pronounc'd to be the Image, *the express Image of His PERSON*, or Hypostasis; how can he chuse

(e) S. John 1. 1, 3.

128 *An Antidote against Arianism.*

but be *Invisible* like Him? and in truth *invisible* GOD too? For here, *Image* lies not in *Features*, but infinite *Excellencies*.

3. The Supreme GOD is said to be *Omni-potent*. And the same is affirm'd of CHRIST. For he is proclaim'd not only (f) the *MIGHTY* GOD, *Isaiah* 9. 6: but (g) the *ALMIGHTY*, *Rev.* 1. 8. *The Epithet of GOD alone*, says *Scapula*.

4. The Supreme GOD is said to be the *Omniscient* GOD. And so is CHRIST acknowledg'd to be by his prime Apostle. *LORD Thou knowest all things*, *S. John* 21. 17. And what less than *Omniscience* is ascrib'd to Him, *S. John* 2. 24, 25? Where it is recorded of him from above, that he *knew all Men*, and that he *knew what is in Man*. (h) *In the Secret or Bottom of his Heart*, says *Grotius*, which is proper to GOD.

5. The Supreme GOD is said to be the *Great* GOD. And CHRIST by the SPIRIT is pronounc'd to be the same, *Tit.* 2. 13. Where the appearing of our SAVIOUR JESUS CHRIST, is said to be *the Glorious Appearing of that (i) Great GOD*, and our SAVIOUR JESUS CHRIST.

(f) אל ניבר.

(g) Πατοχεταρ, Epitherum folius DEI.

(h) In cordis intimo, quod Dei proprium.

(i) Τῷ μεγάλῳ ΘΕΟΤΙ καὶ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν ΙΗΣΟΥ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΙ. Without so much as a Comma.

6. The

6. The Supreme GOD is said to be *the True God*. And so is CHRIST in like manner, 1 S. John 5. 20. *This is the True GOD*. Nor can the Words be made to point at any other but CHRIST, without *straining* them, and putting *force* upon them. And to no other End, that I can see, but to favour *Arianism*, or countenance *Socinians*. For the last PERSON St. John spake of, was JESUS CHRIST; and of him he goes on to say, *This is the true GOD*. And to carry the demonstrative Pronoun, *this*, farther back without necessity, would be to strain the Expression and make it unnatural. Besides, that *this is the true GOD*, must relate to the SON, is plain; because the FATHER was said to be *true GOD* before; and to affirm that of him again, would be to croud a nauseous Tautology into the Text. Moreover; S. John calls the true GOD he there speaks of, *Eternal LIFE*; by which Title he plainly points at CHRIST; styling *Him* so more than once in this Epistle.

7. The Supreme GOD is said to be *the only GOD*. And CHRIST is known by the same *Appellative*, in the 4th verse of S. Jude's Epistle. For there that Apostle vouches him to be (1) *that only Master, GOD, and LORD of ours*.

(1) Τὸν μόνον Δεσπότην ΘΕΟΝ καὶ ΚΥΡΙΟΝ ἡμῶν ΙΗΣΟΥ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΝ. Without a Comma again.

8. The Supreme GOD is said to be *the blessed GOD*. And must not CHRIST be so too, when He is expressly so called, and enter'd as such in the Records of Heaven? GOD *blessed*, Rom. 9. 5.

9. The Supreme GOD is said to be *the Eternal GOD*. And how can CHRIST be thought or esteemed otherwise, when as the Text fore-quoted tells us, He is *GOD Blessed for ever*? He ever was Blessed, that is, and so he shall ever be. And therefore Melchisedeck, who prefigur'd him, is said to *(l) have neither beginning of days, nor end of Life*; that he might truly represent his perfect Eternity.

10. The Supreme GOD is said to be *the Living GOD*. And what is CHRIST less? For he is *(m) the WORD of LIFE*, and what is that, but GOD of Life? And as the FATHER *bath a LIFE in Himself*, S. John 5. 26; so the SON bath a LIFE in Himself as we are there told. And tho' the FATHER gave that LIFE to CHRIST, yet that hinders him no more from being a Divine LIFE in himself; than his being begotten of the FATHER hinders him from being GOD the SON. But as he must be his SON because he was *generated* by him, so he must be Divine LIFE because he *issu'd immediately* from him, Who is such a LIFE Himself. And truly how could CHRIST be either Ble

(l) Heb. 11. 7.

(m) S. Joh. 1. 1.

sed, or *Eternal GOD* (as now was shewed) if he were not *Ever-living*?

11. The Supreme *GOD* is said to be the *Good GOD*. And if *CHRIST* be not so called, yet if he actually *is so*; want of the Title can be no defect, when he hath the *Attribute* to Perfection. And that he so has it, is easily proved. For as (n) *He created all things*, so by *Him they consist*, or are sustained. As he *made*, so he *supports* them all, and holds them together in their stately Frame. And as nothing but infinite *Power* could do such Acts, so what save infinite *Goodness* could induce that Power to exert it self in them? And then if we look to his Mediatorial Office, what *infinite Goodness* has he there express'd, in astonishing Condescensions, Sufferings, and Benefactions to Mankind?

Indeed he declares, *S. Mar. 10. 18. There is none Good but One, that is, GOD*. And most true it is in this high Sense: *that none is so originally GOOD as GOD is*. No, not *CHRIST* Himself. For as the *FATHER* gave to the *SON* to have *LIFE* in Himself, or gave him his *PERSON*; so thereby he gave him to have infinite *GOODNESS* in himself too. But then *his Goodness* being derivative from his *FATHER*, how can it be absolutely so excellent as *His*, when it is not so

(n) Coloss. 1. 16.

132 *An Antidote against Arianism.*

Self-originated? Tho' CHRIST is perfect GOD, and infinitely and eternally Good still; notwithstanding that Concession. For when he gave the Preference to his FATHER's *Goodness*, he did it justly upon account of its *Primity* as to *Order*; not as to Superiority in Excellency or Degree.

12. The Supreme GOD is said to be the GOD of Heaven. And is not CHRIST the same? For who is the GOD of Heaven more than he that *made* it? But CHRIST who *made all things* must needs make *that*, and so have all Right to *this* Denomination.

13. The Supreme GOD is said to be the Wise GOD. And the same thing is said of CHRIST in other Words. For He is CHRIST the *Wisdom of GOD*, 1 Cor. 1. 24. And CHRIST in whom are hid all the *Treasures of Wisdom and Knowledge*, Col. 2. 5. Expressions that speak him consummately Wise and infinitely Knowing and Intelligent.

14. The Supreme GOD is said to be the Immortal GOD. And that CHRIST is so we are well assur'd by S. John's ascribing to him *Glory and Dominion, for ever and ever* Revel. 1. 6. And how could he be capable of *Glory and Dominion for ever and ever*, were he not *Immortal*?

Lastly, The Supreme GOD is said to be the Highest. And is not the same Epithet agreeable to CHRIST? For he is GOD over all, Rom. 9. 5. And what is that, o

who

who is he, but GOD MOST HIGH? To which the Baptist gave authentick Testimony, *S. John 3. 31. He that cometh from above, is above all.* And to strengthen it he repeated it, *He that cometh from Heaven, is above all.* That is, in respect of his Origin, and Divine Nature he surmounts even all Creatures.

Now do not these *Fifteen* Titles, all from Heaven, sufficiently confirm CHRIST's DIVINITY? And if *some* of them be not so plain, and positive, and *express* as others; yet they are all his *due*, and he may justly challenge them as his Right.

Here then let every sincere and solid Christian fix his foot, and never stir the least from such pregnant Evidence. What are hundreds of *humane* Testimonies against these *Divine ones*? And how should the Epithets thus given to CHRIST in Scripture, silence all that Question his DEITY? Especially if we consider, that they are the most *transcendent*, and *distinguishing* ones, which the *Supreme* GOD has assum'd to himself, to notify and ascertain He is *That* GOD. And for the same reason, and to the same End the HOLY GHOST has given them unto CHRIST, and fil'd them amongst the Sacred Records of Heaven; as standing and most infallible Testimonies of his *natural* DIVINITY.

The *Second* Argument for CHRIST's DEITY, shall be his requiring Divine Honour of

134 *An Antidote against Arianism.*

all Mankind. This he does *S. John 5. 23.* Where he openly declar'd (and in the midst of *Jerusalem*) that *all Men should honour the SON, even as they honour the FATHER.* And *he that honoureth not the SON (at that rate) honoureth not the FATHER.* The Honour Men pay to *GOD the FATHER,* is *Divine* in the highest Degree. Yet the *same exactly* which is given to his Glorious *FATHER,* *CHRIST* demanded *for Himself.* Now when he challeng'd a parity of Honour with his *FATHER,* it must be for good and sufficient Reason: but what meet or adequate Reason could there be for claiming *equal Honour* with *Him*; but his having a *Nature equal to His*? And were he *but a Man* (as some would make *Him*) yet according to the account Heaven gives of him, he must be the *Best* that ever lived. Now what *truly good Man,* tho' but *ordinarily* so, was ever thus bold as to claim *GOD's Honour* as due to *himself*; and would not rather *die* than be so presumptuous? And the *better* a Man is the more he would abhor, and the faster and farther would he flee from such arrogance and blasphemy. But how then could *CHRIST* if but a *Man* publicly insist upon being honoured even as *GOD*? The ground of his claiming that honour therefore must be his own *Divine Nature* which indeed intitles him to it.

But against this an *Objection* may be rais'd out of the Context. Namely, that the *Honour* demanded by CHRIST is not *due* to him as GOD, but for an *high Office* conferr'd upon him. For in *S. John* 5. 22. He informs us, that the *FATHER* hath committed all Judgment to the *SON*: and then it follows immediately (as a consequence of that *Prerogative*) that all Men should honour the *SON*, even as they honour the *FATHER*.

I answer, 1st, CHRIST indeed is the Great and General Judge of all. But no Judge, as such, can be equal to the Power that constitutes him. For the very giving and taking of a *Deputation* implies in the Donour *Superiority*; and *Inferiority* in the Receiver. And so CHRIST's being deputed Judge of the World, if but a *Man*, could not qualify him to be honour'd as GOD. Between a Judge and the Person that appoints him, there's as great Difference as between a *King* and his *Subject*; and should he but accept the Royal Honours due to his Sovereign that commissioned him, tho' without *claiming* them: it would be an hainous *Crime*. But then between GOD the *FATHER*, and CHRIST but a *Man* tho' made our Judge, there being *Infinite Disparity*; for him to assume his *FATHER's* Honour, would plunge him into inconceivable Guilt.

And therefore I answer, 2^{dly}; as CHRIST is the Supreme Judge, so at the same time he is really

136 *An Antidote against Arianism.*

really GOD. And as he is to judge the World in his mix'd Person or Capacity ; so He is to be honour'd as GOD for his *Divine Nature*, and so not only for his *Judicial Authority*. And accordingly where he is pronounced Judge, he is frequently proclaimed GOD. *How shall GOD judge the World ? Rom. 3. 6. GOD the Judge of all, Heb. 12. 23. GOD shall judge the Righteous and the Wicked, Ecclef. 3. 17.* And that CHRIST must be the Judge meant, is certain ; because *all Judgment is committed to him*, as above.

Whence it is manifest, that the Honour like his FATHER's, which he insisted on, is not due to him, or expected by him as *universal Judge* ; but as he is *truly GOD*.

And CHRIST having own'd he shall be the Great Judge ; as a

Third Argument to prove His DEITY, I alledge that *stately Office of his*. For judging the World is a *Work so Difficult* as well as *Magnificent* ; that *none but GOD* can be fit to undertake, or *able to accomplish it*. If we enter but superficially into solemn Thoughts of it, we shall soon find it so.

For look to the whole Race of Mankind in their successive Generations upon Earth ; and how multitudinous must they be at last ? Then call to mind their different Relations, and respective Qualities both Sacred and Civil ; together with their various Stations, Callings, Capacities and Circumstances ; as Personal

and Social ; Political, and Ecclesiastick ; Domestic, and Mechanical, &c : and must not all these be exceeding Numerous ; and Accounts in reference to them as various and intricate ? And when all the Myriads of Mankind, must be answerable to the Glorious Judge at last, for all their Carriages relating to these and many other Particulars ; it must needs be much too hard a Task for any *meer Man*, to determine the numberless Cases here, tho' he be indu'd with all possible Perfections.

For to pass by the Acts and Habits of *Virtue* and *Piety*, which are not to be enumerated ; tho' highly to be regarded, and recompenc'd proportionably : how manifold and innumerable are the *Sins* of Men ? As against GOD, their Neighbours, and Themselves ; and of Deed, Word, and Thought, All which with their respective Aggravations, must come into account, and be weigh'd in the strict Balance of the Final Judicature. Now what *meer Man* can attain to a previous and punctual *Knowledge* of all *these*, and Judge rightly concerning them ? Or indeed can Judge at all touching the *last* nam'd, *mental Sins*, that is, or *naughty Thoughts* ?

For even them we must brand for *hainous things*, especially if they grow up into wicked *Purposes*, or mischievous *Projects* ; tho' they go no farther than the *Mind*, and so act in no Scenes but what *that* admits of. And yet,

yet, I say, what *Man*? what *meer* Man can dive into these Enormities, and discover their several Guilts, and apportion just Punishments to them? For so occult or clandestine are they, that there's no finding out the measures of their malignity.

For alas! from Heaven we are inform'd, that *no Man knoweth the Things of a Man* (and then much less his *Thoughts*) *save the Spirit of a Man which is in him*, 1 Cor. 2. 11. Nay, the best of Men seem not to be acquainted with all *their own* obliquities; and therefore the *Psalmist* pray'd for pardon of his *unknown* Sins: *who can understand his errors? cleanse thou me from my secret faults.* A plain evidence that good People (who have most spiritual Light) are yet in the dark to some of their own Crimes. They lurk so close, and lie so hid in them, that they can't discern them. And how then shall any one Man get perfect Knowledge of the immoral Thoughts of all Men or Women, that are, or were, or ever shall be upon Earth? That must be attainable by none but GOD, to (n) whose Eyes all things are naked, and open'd; tho' to us they be never so secret.

Should any alledge, that the First Christians had a Power of discerning Spirits; and would GOD but please to raise that to the height in any Person, it would make him knowing enough to judge the World: I

(n) Heb. 4. 13.

would answer thus. That with the *Primitives* there was a *Gift of discerning*, or discriminating Spirits, plainly appears in 1 Cor. 12. 10. And this some learned Expositors have stretch'd so far, as to assert that by it they could *know the Thoughts and Intentions of Hearts*. But here I must dissent from them, and think I have good Authority for it. For where the wisest Man that ever lived spake by Inspiration, he assures us that GOD alone can do that. *Thou, even Thou only knowest the hearts of all the Children of Men*, 1 Kin. 8. 39. אתה לבדך *Thou, Thou only*; a Word most full and pregnant. And to it the Septuagint answers emphatically, *ὁ μόνος*, which I had almost render'd, *tu solissimus*, *Thou onliest*; GOD being most perfectly alone here, and *superlatively singular* in this kind of Knowledge. *Discerning* or *dijudicating Spirits* therefore could not be *knowing hearts*, that being peculiar to GOD Himself; but only a supernatural Sagacity of discerning the moral *dispositions*, or *inclinations* of people, whether they were *habitually good*, and of the true *Evangelical Temper* or not. And that *Spirit*, in the Gospel, signifies the *Temper* of Men, or the *bent*, or *Habit* of their Minds; will be very plain to all intelligent and ad-vertent Perusers of it.

And to discern these, is easier than discerning *Thoughts*, or *Hearts*. Insomuch that Men of Parts and Penetration by conversing with

with People and observing them, may go a great way in *discerning their Spirits* thus, without the mention'd Charisma, or Gift: tho' with that it was done *effectually*. For S. Peter discern'd the insincerity of *Ananias*, and *Sapphira*; and discover'd *Simon*, taken for the great Power of GOD, to be no better than a *Child of the Devil*. Which St. Philip was so far from finding out, that he thought him a true Believer, and accordingly (o) *Baptiz'd* him. And by virtue of this Discerning Power, false Prophets were then detected, and Pretenders to Religion proved Counterfeits; and for their hateful Dissimulation laid under Ecclesiastical Censures. Yet this by no means can amount to knowing *Thoughts*, or *Hearts*; for that, we see, is GOD's *sole Prerogative*. And therefore as He's said to be the *Knower of hearts*, *Act. 15. 8*; so it is as much his Privilege to know all hearts; *Thou, LORD, knowest the hearts of all Men, Act. 1. 24*. That is, he has both an ampler, and a clearer knowledge of us, than we have of our selves. And this is no more than *Heathens* attributed to their Deities. For *Thales* being askt, *whether any could do Evil and hide it from GOD*; he answer'd, *No, not in Thought*. And concerning them the (p) *Satyrist* affirms, *a Man is better known*

(o) *Act. 8. 13.*

(p) *Juvenal.* Notior est illis homo quam sibi.

to them, *than to himself.* The same Notion which our Divine Writer taught of the true GOD in other terms; *GOD is greater than our Hearts and knoweth all things,* 1 S. Job. 3. 20. And doubtless, he knoweth many things *in and of us,* that to *us* are *Secrets.* And as *Secrets* are said to *belong unto the LORD,* Deut. 29. 29: so it is remarkable, that where-ever Scripture mentions *knowing Secrets, revealing Secrets, or judging Secrets;* all the Acts are not only put upon GOD, but appropriated to Him. *He knoweth the Secrets of the heart,* Psal. 44. 2. And *he revealeth Secrets,* Dan. 2. 29. And *GOD shall Judge the Secrets of Men,* Rom. 2. 16. Exclusively, that is, of all others.

But then he that is to *Judge* of these *Secrets,* ought to *know* them; and should be *infinitely knowing* in his Person, to be perfectly *Just* in his Procedure. Nay, he *must* be the *one,* that he *may* be the *other.* Where Skill is wanting in difficult Cases, the Sentence will be crooked: and therefore that the Judge, I speak of, may be gloriously Upright; he must be infinitely *Just*; and to make him so he must be as *Intelligent.* For he must know the *heart,* and *all Mens Hearts,* and *all the Secrets* of them. And withal he must keep their secretest Enormities, even their very *Thoughts* in remembrance. And remember them he must not only while they *live,* but when they are *dead*: that so he may charge
De-

Delinquents with their proper Crimes, and punish them according to their respective guilts.

Now, if this Knowledge can be in none but GOD (as where is it else?) and if CHRIST is to be the Judge as he surely is; for (q) *we shall all stand before his Judgment Seat*; and (r) *we must all appear before the Judgment Seat of CHRIST*: from hence it will follow, that he must be GOD; Judging the World being so much above every Creature's ability, as requiring a Knowledge so very piercing as well as vast and comprehensive.

Yet such a Knowledge, I say, must be in that Sovereign Judge. For every one being then to be (s) *Judged according to his Works*; to the Works of his *Mind*, (his *Thoughts* and *Purposes*, that is, as well as of his *Hands*;) He must understand every *mental Act* that is sinful, that so he may sute the Wicked's Penalties exactly to their Offences. Else the punitive part of Distributive Justice can't be well administred. Infinite Knowledge therefore must be as needful for this Judge, as it is for *Him* to be *righteous*.

Especially if we consider, that he must Judge *Angels too*. Which will add much to the *Difficulty* of the Work, and render it more invincible still to a meer Man, tho' ex-

(q) Rom. 14. 10. (r) 2 Cor. 5. 10. (s) Rev. 20. 13.
altd

alted to the utmost capacity of his Nature. For if the hearts of impious Men are Deep, *Psal. 64. 6* ; what *Profundities* then and perfect *Abysses* must wicked Angels be? Yet these Angels shall then be Judged : for says *St. Jude*, they are reserved in everlasting Chains unto the Judgment of the great day. And then shall they be judged by the *Saints* too ; for we shall judge Angels, *1 Cor. 6. 3.* That is, by approving the Sentence with our Suffrages, which the High Judge shall denounce against them.

But then He that can know and remember not only all *Actions*, and *Words*, but all *Thoughts* and *Intentions* of such a Numberless Number as all *evil Angels*, and all *Mankind* at last will make, and can retain them in Memory till they are summon'd to his Tribunal ; when the Parties concern'd are of so different Natures, Sexes, Frames, Faculties, Parts, Ages, Orders, Relations, Religions, Callings, and Employments ; all which, and many other considerations he must regard, to adjust their particular allotments to their respective Demerits : how can this Person be less than GOD Omniscient? But CHRIST being GOD, for Him it must be as easy to keep all *Thoughts*, and *Words*, and *Actions* of All Delinquents in his infinite Memory, as it is for Him to fill all Places *with*, and comprehend all things *in* his infinite Expansion.

And

And indeed he ought thus to remember upon his *own account*. I mean, that things may be laudably done, according to rules of exact *Justice* and strictest *Integrity*. As the famous Patriarch expostulated, *shall not the Judge of all the Earth do right?* That he must do in *all cases*; but then how much *more* in the *Last Judicature*? Which as it must be of *Eternal Consequence* to *us*, and therefore had need be equitable: so on GOD's Part it is proclaim'd before-hand, not only to be the *Righteous Judgment*; but the *Revelation of the Righteous Judgment of GOD*, *Rom. 2. 5.* Implying it shall be so *apparently* just and fair; as to approve it self perfectly to sharpest Criticks (whether Angels, Men, or Devils) in every punctilio.

The *Fourth Proof* of CHRIST's DIVINITY shall be this; *He has Two Natures*. I make it evident from Scripture. And 1st, from the account which Heaven there gives of *Melchisedeck*, by whom he was typified. The HOLY GHOST assures us, *Heb. 7. 3.* that he was *without Mother*. But how could CHRIST come up to that Instance in the Type; if besides his *Humane*, he had not a *Divine Nature*? For his *Humane Nature* was conceived *by*, bred *in*, and born *of a Woman*. And then that he might be ἀμήτωρ, *without a Mother*, and so come up and rightly correspond to *Melchisedeck* in that Point; he must needs have a *Divine Nature*

too. For his humanity was born of a Woman, and *had a Mother* as certainly as ever Man had; tho' without an humane Father.

In short, as *Melchisedeck* is here (a) *liken'd to the SON of GOD*, and one piece of that Assimilation lies in his being *androgæ, without Father*; to which part of *Melchisedeck's* Character *CHRIST* answer'd exactly in his *Humanity*: so the same *Melchisedeck* being as much *CHRIST's Emblem* as he was *without Mother* too, *CHRIST* must come up to him as strictly and literally *there* likewise; and so he actually does in respect of his *DIVINITY*. For in reference to his *Divine Nature* he was as much without a *Mother*; as in regard of his *Humane* he was without a *Father*. And necessary it was that he should be so. For amongst other Members, or Particulars of this *Parallel* here drawn in some measure; or *comparison* made between *Melchisedeck* and *CHRIST*; or rather in this *Description* where the King of *Salem* represents the *SON of GOD*: his being *without Father*, and *without Mother*, are two most plainly expressed. But then we must remember, that what was but typifi'd, or shadow'd out in *Melchisedeck*, was actually contain'd, and really exhibited in *CHRIST*. And so where the one was said to be *without Mother* (because no mention is made of her Name) the other must truly be *so*; which

(a) Ἀντιστοιχεί.

yet CHRIST could not be as to his *humane Nature*, and therefore He *must* certainly have a *Divine one*. Else Melchisedeck who is here made a lively Emblem of Him, and particularly as he was *without Mother*; must in that point be *falsely* assimilated to Him. But because what the HOLY GHOST asserts cannot be *untrue*; CHRIST must be God. He having had a *Mother* as he was *Man*. A strong and incontestable Argument for His DEITY.

2dly, That CHRIST hath *two Natures*, may from Scripture be argu'd thus. That informs us, St. John 21. 17. that the LORD CHRIST *knoweth* all things. Yet in St. Mark 13. 32. it is said; *of that day* (the day of Judgment) *knoweth no Man, no, not the Angels which are in Heaven, neither the SON, but the FATHER*. Now if CHRIST knew *all things*, the Day of Judgment must needs be one: but then he *not knowing that as the Son*, or in his humane Capacity; he must know it by virtue of his Divine Nature, or as he was GOD. Else when St. Peter own'd he was *Omniscient*, and the SPIRIT recorded it as *Truth*; it must be an *Error*, and a very *gross* one: and then He would not have enter'd it amongst the Oracles of Heaven. And that CHRIST was made up and consists of *two Natures*, is plainly owned by Irenaeus. Who in his fourth Book *against Heresies*, tells us, that our LORD JESUS CHRIST was made Man in the last days, Ut finem conjun-

geret Principio, id est, hominem DEO: *that he might join the End to the Beginning, that is, Man to GOD.* Per quem commixtio & communio DEI & hominis secundum placitum Patris facta est. *By whom according to the Father's pleasure was made a Mixture and Communion of GOD and Man.* cap. 37.

A Fifth Argument for CHRIST's DIVINITY shall be *his pardoning Sins.* That he had Power to do this was manifested by his favour to the Paralytick, S. Mar. 2. 5. *Son thy Sins are forgiven thee.* Against which the Scribes immediately excepted, as a bold affront to GOD's MAJESTY, and a daring incroachment on his Prerogative. So the following Question they put plainly intimates; *Who can forgive Sins but GOD only? v. 7.* From which mental interrogatory of theirs (who reason'd in their hearts touching CHRIST's forgiving Sins) we may thus conclude. That it was then the avow'd Opinion of the *only true Church* that for a long time had been in the World; *that GOD alone could forgive Sins.* And very good reason there is for it. For all Sin is committed against GOD chiefly. And who has or can have right, power, or even just pretence to forgive Indignities; but he that sustain'd them, or suffered by them? So that had not CHRIST been GOD, upon whom Sins chiefly terminate; his forgiving them would have been an irregular Act, for which he could not have fairly answer'd.

148 *An Antidote against Arianism.*

Should it be here demanded, if CHRIST were GOD, why did he not upon this occasion *affirm* it, and put it out of doubt by owning expressly that He was so? I might answer. He did *more* here to manifest he was GOD, than if he had plainly *affirm'd* it. For he made it appear that he knew the *Secret Reasonings of the Scribes*, and the right *close Thought* they had, that GOD *only* could *forgive Sins*. And then by *actual forgiving* them in their presence, he openly *did*, what by their own Testimony, *none but GOD could do*. And which is more; at the same time he wrought so glorious a Miracle in curing the Sick Man; as sufficiently argu'd his *Omnipotence*, and so *demonstrated* he was GOD. All which is enough, not only to render *them* inexcusable that would not believe he was so; but withal to convince that he prov'd not his GODHEAD by *verbal Arguments*, because he knew they would refuse these *Weaker*, by their rejecting those *Stronger Evidences*.

And that forgiving Sins belongs to GOD only, is inferrible from the following Considerations.

1st, *From his inserting it into his Name, and making it so considerable a part of that.* The Name I mean, was thus proclaim'd to Moses (u) *The LORD, the LORD GOD, Merciful*

(u) Exod. 34. 6, 7.

and Gracious, Long suffering, and abundant in Goodness and Truth. Keeping Mercy for thousands, forgiving Iniquity, and Transgression, and Sin, &c. Now the Great Titles which make up this Name, shewing the Properties of GOD's Nature ; and *Forgiving Sins* being one of them, and most emphatically express'd, and ascrib'd to Him : from hence it follows, that only the LORD GOD whose Name it is, has the Power and Privilege of Forgiving Sins *naturally* in Himself. None else can rightly pretend to that Prerogative, but they who can claim the Title of LORD GOD, *Merciful and Gracious*, &c ; as justly due unto themselves ; which only the *Divine THREE* can do.

And therefore when others dispense that Favour, it is done but *declaratively* ; not from their own personal *Authority*, but by *Commission* from GOD. So all *Ministers* of CHRIST do, and so all his *Apostles* did. Nay, even *Popes* themselves, some of which forgave Sins at most extravagant Rates ; did it as pretended *Vicars* of CHRIST. Tho' there they assum'd a wretched and insufferable Liberty to themselves.

2dly, Pardoning of Sins GOD *expressly* appropriates to Himself. So we find in *Isai.* 43. 25. I, even I am he that blotteth out thy transgressions for mine own sake. As much as to say, cancelling Sins, and absolving Delinquents from their Guilt ; belongs solely

to me, And whenever I do cross out Transgressions, it is not done by my *Power only* as absolute as it is; but by the *Energy*, and upon the account of my *immense Goodness*. And so none can pardon Sins against GOD, in the *strictest Sense*, but as they participate of his Nature. Another Prophet also ascertains that to be GOD's *peculiar Work*; and that for doing it he is *Peerless*. *Who is a GOD like unto Thee, that pardoneth Iniquity, Mich. 7. 18?* He therefore that can pardon Iniquity, is not only to be like GOD, but must be GOD Himself, with whom no Creature can compare.

3dly, Forgiving Sins must be GOD's Property, because our LORD directs us to him only for it. So in that admirable Form of His design'd for a common Rule for Prayer, or for constant Use, or else for Both; He sends us to our Heavenly FATHER with this Petition: *Forgive us our Trespases*. And then to make his Direction the more influential, he backt it with his own *exemplary practice*. For when he was dying on the Cross, he pray'd for his Persecutors unto Him with eximious Charity; *FATHER, forgive them, for they know not what they do, S. Luke 23. 34.* Clear Evidence that *Forgiving Sins* belongs to GOD only.

But then CHRIST's exercising that Power before his Death, must be a good Indication of his DEITY. For he being not vested with

with the Fullness of Authority over his CHURCH, till after his Resurrection, *S. Mat.* 28. 18 : his forgiving Sins *before his Death*, shews it was not done by *adventitious* Power, but by that *naturally* in him as GOD.

And that he had Power inherent in him to *Forgive Sins* before his Passion, He took particular care to acquaint us with in the Ninth of *S. Matthew*. For he there signifies, that he heal'd the Sick Man by saying, *Thy Sins are forgiven thee*; rather than by saying, *arise and walk* : on purpose that we might know that the Son of Man had power on Earth to forgive Sins, *v. 6th*. Meaning that he had Power to do it, *ex proprio*, of his own Right and Ability as GOD. And therefore says *Grotius*, (*w*) *CHRIST does not here concern himself in announcing Pardon as Nathan did to David, &c. : but acts from the Power of pardoning Sin by his own Will and Authority*. And according to *Beza* on a parallel Text, (*x*) When *CHRIST* said to the Sick Man, *I say unto thee, arise, &c.* It was as if he said, *acknowledge ye me also to be the true GOD*. And how very desirous was the *Messiah* that the *Jews* should have done so ; when he declar'd he forgave the Sinner by his *own power*, and then cured the poor Clinick mira-

(*w*) Non agit de annuntiatione veniæ, quæ *Nathani* etiam ad *Davidem*, & aliis Prophetis mandata fuerit, sed de potestate peccata suo arbitrio remittendi. *In loc.*

(*x*) Ac si diceret *CHRISTUS*, agnoscite me verum quoque DEUM esse, *In Marc. 2. 10.*

culously? What more cogent or clinching Argument could they have wisht, to draw them *to*, and fix them *in* the Belief of his DEITY; when they were thro'ly perswaded *that none could forgive Sins but GOD only*; and openly own'd as much? And tho' he was pleas'd to vail his Glory with the mean and low Appellative, *the Son of Man*; that only express'd his Theanthropous Constitution by a *Synecdoche*, a Figure common in the Sacred Books.

A *Sixth* Argument to prove CHRIST is GOD, may be *his Dispensing Divine Graces*. For that implies he is the proper and *natural Source* of them; and whence can divine Streams flow, but from as divine a Fountain? And as every good Fountain contains a rich plenty, and inexhaustible Fullness in it: so in CHRIST there's a vast and infinite exuberance of these precious Excellencies. And therefore he is said to be full of Grace, *S. Job. 1. 14.* So full as freely to *overflow* into all meet Receivers. And therefore we are told in the next verse but one, that *out of his Fullness all good Christians receive Grace for Grace*. So that look what various Graces are in him, and so far as they are needful, they shall be imparted to *us*, if we be *his*. But then GOD being *the GOD of all Grace*, *1 S. Pet. 5. 10*; all Grace must come from *Him*. And if all Grace comes from GOD, and the whole Church receives all Grace from

from CHRIST: This again helps to prove his DIVINITY.

And truly how could such a *Fullness* of Grace be *in* him but by virtue of *another Fullness* he has of an higher Nature? I mean, that mention'd in *Colos. 2. 9.* Where 'tis said that *in him dwelleth* all the Fullness of the GODHEAD *bodily*. A word so pregnant, that how could the learned, even by *Study*, have found out a fitter in the case? For what does the GODHEAD, and the FULLNESS of it, and ALL its Fullness import? and All that Fullness not residing *with*, or resting *upon* CHRIST, but DWELLING *in* Him; and that BODILY too; not in an obscure and shadowy way, but compleatly as well as really, and as truly and perfectly as a Body can be in any place, tho' not so visibly and palpably? What *does*, or what *can* this, I say, import; but that CHRIST is a PERSON *absolutely* DIVINE in all possible Measures and Perfections? And as thus *subsisting, bodily*, falls in fairly with *ὄν* which signifies *Entity*; and then the very Being of the DIVINITY must dwell in CHRIST, as it certainly does by hypostatick Union: so that *Hebrew* Word signifies *Himself*, as well; according to which, *Ipsemet* DEUS, GOD himself must dwell in our LORD's Humanity. Tho' indeed dwelling *Bodily* in it seems so mean a Term when applied to GOD; that had he not pleas'd to utter

154 *An Antidote against Arianism.*

ter it of himself (in condescension to *us*, who in part are *Body*, and converse so *much* and *continually* with it) we might have thought it too bold a Word, and unagreeable to his MAJESTY.

And that *Grace* is deriv'd from CHRIST, and that his Dispensing it shews he is GOD; may be gathered from an Evangelical Instance; *that* in the *Ninth* of *S. Mark*. There a poor Man bringing his Child to CHRIST to be cur'd of a Chronical Epilepsy; begg'd of him *increase of his Faith*. Our LORD telling him, *all things are possible to him that believeth*; he straightway cry'd out with tears, LORD, *I believe, help thou my Unbelief*. Now this Petition, had not CHRIST been GOD, he would have rejected, (as any good Man, or Angel must have done) and also have reprimanded him that presented it. For by it he made him the *Object* of his *Faith* and *Prayer* both, when GOD *only* can be so of either. Yet still the LORD healed his Child without reproving him. A sure Sign that the Father was *right* in both Acts; and that CHRIST being GOD, he neither *misplac'd* his *Trust*, nor *misapply'd* his *Devotion*.

That CHRIST is truly GOD, may be made good in the *Seventh* place, *by his own Resurrection*. That is, as it was wrought by *Himself*. For as he had power to lay down his life, so he had power to take it again, *S. Job. 10. 18.* By which power he might mean

mean *Ἀυτοκρατορία*, Omnipotence, that Supreme absolute Power, which is proper to the DEITY. And having this Power in himself, he might well declare as he did, (γ) *Destroy this Temple* (meaning his Body) *and in three days I will raise it up again.* Which having foretold explicitly, he was oblig'd to do; for had he fail'd in his Prediction, he must have been a false Prophet. And the more notorious, for that he assum'd to himself the Title of (z) *Truth*; and so vouch'd to his Profelytes an inviolable *Veracity*. But then when in the event he actually perform'd it as he did; how could he be less than GOD? For was it ever heard, or known, or can it be *thought*, that a dead Man should raise himself to life?

Indeed when he said he had power to resume his Life, he added immediately, *This Commandment have I received of my FATHER.* But that does not at all *imply*, much less prove, that CHRIST was not rais'd by his *own Power*. When he came to do the great and happy Work of our *Redemption*, it was all in *compliance with*, and in *obedience* to his FATHER. So we learn from his own Mouth, by words of his which we find more than once in the tenth of the *Hebrews*, *Lo, I come to do Thy Will O GOD,* Now when CHRIST Prayed, Preached, wrought Mira-

(γ) S. John. 2. 19.

(z) Ibid. 14. 6.

154 *An Antidote against Arianism.*

ter it of himself (in condescension to *us*, who in part are *Body*, and converse so *much* and *continually* with it) we might have thought it too bold a Word, and unagreeable to his MAJESTY.

And that *Grace* is deriv'd from CHRIST, and that his Dispensing it shews he is GOD; may be gathered from an Evangelical Instance; *that* in the *Ninth* of *S. Mark*. There a poor Man bringing his Child to CHRIST to be cur'd of a Chronical Epilepsy; begg'd of him *increase of his Faith*. Our LORD telling him, *all things are possible to him that believeth*; he straightway cry'd out with tears, LORD, I believe, help thou my Unbelief. Now this Petition, had not CHRIST been GOD, he would have rejected, (as any good Man, or Angel must have done) and also have reprimanded him that presented it. For by it he made him the *Object* of his *Faith* and *Prayer* both, when GOD *only* can be so of either. Yet still the LORD healed his Child without reproving him. A sure Sign that the Father was *right* in both Acts; and that CHRIST being GOD, he neither *misplac'd* his *Trust*, nor *misapply'd* his *Devotion*.

That CHRIST is truly GOD, may be made good in the *Seventh* place, by his *own Resurrection*. That is, as it was wrought by *Himself*. For as he had power to lay down his life, so he had power to take it again, *S. Job. 10. 18.* By which power he might mean

mean *Ἀυτοκρατορία*, Omnipotence, that Supreme absolute Power, which is proper to the DEITY. And having this Power in himself, he might well declare as he did, (y) *Destroy this Temple* (meaning his Body) *and in three days I will raise it up again.* Which having foretold explicitly, he was oblig'd to do; for had he fail'd in his Prediction, he must have been a false Prophet. And the more notorious, for that he assum'd to himself the Title of (z) *Truth*; and so vouch'd to his Profelytes an inviolable *Veracity*. But then when in the event he actually perform'd it as he did; how could he be less than GOD? For was it ever heard, or known, or can it be *thought*, that a dead Man should raise himself to life?

Indeed when he said he had power to resume his Life, he added immediately, *This Commandment have I received of my FATHER.* But that does not at all *imply*, much less prove, that CHRIST was not rais'd by his *own Power*. When he came to do the great and happy Work of our *Redemption*, it was all in *compliance with*, and in *obedience* to his FATHER. So we learn from his own Mouth, by words of his which we find more than once in the tenth of the *Hebrews*, *Lo, I come to do Thy Will O GOD,* Now when CHRIST Prayed, Preached, wrought Mira-

(y) S. John, 2. 19.

(z) Ibid. 14. 6.

156 *An Antidote against Arianism.*

cles, or *did*, or *suffer'd* any thing that related to that high *Undertaking*; it must be in *Obedience* to his FATHER's *Will*, which was equivalent to his *Command*. Yet all might be done nevertheless by his *own Power*. And so it was in the case of his *Resurrection*. His FATHER commanded him to rise, it was his *Will* he should do it; but still he might and did *raise himself* notwithstanding. Nay, tho' it be said in Scripture, that GOD *raised up JESUS*, and *brought him from the Dead*, and the like; yet this hinders not his being raised by his *own Power* neither. It only implies that the FATHER's Power *concurr'd* with the SON's in that Work, and so it was done by mutual Concert, and their united Energy. And tho' the FATHER had an hand in CHRIST's Resurrection; yet so long as *he* join'd in raising Himself; as above noted; what was done by *both* may equally be predicated of *either*: and so CHRIST's sharing in that glorious Miracle wrought upon his Humane Nature, must argue his DIVINITY: for as a Man He could have no hand in his own rising from the Dead.

An *Eighth Proof* of which shall be the *General Resurrection*. For of that he himself is to be the Cause or Author; and that we might not be surpris'd at it, he has given us clear Notice of as much. *Marvel not at this; for the hour is coming in which all that are in the Graves shall hear his Voice* (the Voice

Voice of the SON of GOD) and shall come forth, they that have done good, unto the Resurrection of Life ; and they that have done evil, unto the Resurrection of Damnation, S. John 5. 28, 29. And tho' doing this may be the FATHER's Will, it is nevertheless the SON's Work, and shall be done by his Power. And in token of as much, he declares, *I am the Resurrection*, S. John 11. 25. And that *he hath the Keys of Hades, and of Death*, Rev. 1. 18. Signifying he has power in himself, to unlock and open all those Difficulties that seem to hinder their Return to Life ; who are retir'd into the Invisible State, and shut up in the secret Recesses of it. And by his power it shall be gloriously done at last, which yet it could not be were he not GOD.

For what meer Man can raise another dead Man to life ? Nay, could all Men living join in consult, and unite their utmost Skill and Strength to restore but one Valetudinary to health ; could they be sure to effect it ? And if they be unable to cure one that is Sick ; how short must they be of reviving and raising all the Dead ? For then the Frame of Bodies will be quite dissolv'd, and the Matter of them, so strangely chang'd and dissipated ; as to become irreparable by humane Art or Force. Yet even then will CHRIST raise them up into a State of Life ; and as many as belong to Him, unto a Life of

158 *An Antidote against Arianism.*

of Blessedness. But then must he not be GOD? The following Considerations duly weigh'd, may evince as much.

And here to pass by the Case of the Anthropophagi, or *Men-eaters*, to which I have spoken (a) else-where; we may consider,

1st, *What in Cæmeteries, or common Burying Places is offer'd to our serious Thoughts.* For where People have been interr'd for hundreds of Years; in reference to the Resurrection we may soon apprehend a *Difficulty insuperable* to every thing but GOD's Wisdom and Power. For the multitudes of Bodies there crowded and amass'd together by frequent and numerous Inhumations; by often digging out the Molds, and as often throwing them in again, the Matter belonging to the numberless Bodies there Buried, must be very strangely commixt, and most confusedly blended together. So much that none but GOD can be able to distinguish them. So to distinguish them, as to assign to all Proprietors their respective Claims; or to allot to each Claimant his proper Right. And were that *more difficult* than it is, yet still to Omnipotence, which made all things out of nothing, it would be easy.

'Tis very strange, and as much surprizing, which *Dioscorides* relates of *Stratiotes*, that

(a) *Geologia. chap. 1. §. 8.*

admirable vulnerary Herb. (b) That it swims upon the Water, and lives without a Root. And that All-wise and Almighty GOD, who causes this Herb to breed and grow upon Waters without a Root; by the same his infinite Wisdom and Power, can as well raise our Dead and consumed Bodies out of the Dust when He pleaseth. A lively and convincing Specimen of which, He gave us at his only SON's Resurrection, S. Mat. 27. 52.

adly, We may consider farther, that the Resurrection of the Righteous Dead shall be instantaneous. For in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump, the Dead shall be raised, and the Living shall be changed, 1 Cor. 15. 52. Another Difficulty utterly invincible but to Omnipotence. And therefore who but GOD can (besides working that sudden mighty Change) put all good Souls in one moment into fresh Bodies; when both Souls and Bodies are so far and near dispers'd, and the latter in such mixture and confusion? Especially if,

Lastly, We consider, how Glorious the Bodies of the Saints shall be. For tho' wicked Reprobates by their Immoralities shall be hideously disfigur'd; and eternal Ugliness shall be one piece of their dreadful Punishment:

(b) *Stratiotes in aquis nascens jisdem supernatar, & sine radice vivit. De Medicin. Mater. li. 4. cap. 87.*

yet the Righteous shall be as curiously adorned, and made extremely Beautiful and lovely. How mean and despicable soever their Persons are at *present*; they shall then be exalted to perfect comeliness. Nor shall they only be amiable, but radiant; and shine and glitter with everlasting Splendors.

Now, as the HOLY GHOST himself tells us, *our Bodies are vile*, Phil. 3. 21. *Calamitous* too often while we live, and *cadaverous* always when we die. Yet if we belong to the Blessed JESUS (and may take that Text in the same Sense that *our Church* does using it in her *Burial Office*;) we may conclude these coarse Bodies of ours, shall at last be *fashioned like to CHRIST's Glorious Body*: which being *his* must certainly be as glorious as can be made of Matter. And when this is to be done by HIM, and to all that are *his*, and in the twinkling of an Eye: can he be less than GOD to perform it? This Act alone which we are sure he shall do, is enough to prove him irrefragably so. Especially when it is to be done (according to that Text) by *his own Energy*, or efficacious force, whereby he is able to subdue all things to Himself. A plain and full Periphrasis of Omnipotence. And if CHRIST's Power be equal to GOD's why not his Nature?

And that CHRIST's raising the Dead shews his DEITY, S. Paul confirms by a very publick and solemn Testimony. I mean,

the

the Question he put in open Court at *Cæsarea*, before *Festus*, and King *Agrippa*, touching the Resurrection, *Act.* 26. 8. *Why should it seem a thing incredible with you, that GOD should raise the Dead?* But then the Dead being most certainly to be raised by GOD; and that great Work being as surely to be done by CHRIST: how fairly does the Apostle hereby witness that *He* is GOD, by Divine Testimony? And accordingly in the fifth Book of the *Apostles Canons* it is affirm'd, that *Almighty GOD Himself shall raise the Dead, but by our LORD JESUS CHRIST*, chap. 6. Wherein proof of the Resurrection many things are gravely alledg'd. But then, by the way, I can't but observe, that the next Chapter, which goes upon *James* the brother of the LORD, and *Stephen* the first Martyr; is not fit to be there inserted. For it positively declares that *they were both καθαροὶ πάσης πλημμελείας*; *puri omnis delicti*; *pure from all Sin*. And can that be a genuine Canon of the Apostles which contradicts their canonical Writings, as this certainly does? *For in many things we offend all*, *S. Ja.* 3. 2. And if we say that we have *no Sin—the truth is not in us*, *1 S. Joh.* 1. 8.

But when all is said, the Blessed THREE in the HOLY TRINITY, shall be every one concern'd in *Raising the Dead* at last; as the two following Texts plainly evidence. *For as the FATHER raiseth up the Dead*; even

M

so

so the SON quickeneth whom he will, S. John 5. 21. But if the SPIRIT of Him that raised up JESUS from the Dead, dwell in you; he that raised up CHRIST from the Dead, shall also quicken your Mortal Bodies by his SPIRIT that dwelleth in you, Ro. 8. 11. And when the FATHER, SON, and SPIRIT do all unanimously consent to, and concur and co-operate in the stupendous Work, which none but GOD can do; it fairly betokens They are all GOD.

The Ninth Argument I offer for our LORD's being so, shall be the Merits and Efficacy of his Sufferings. And a cogent Proof of it they must be if rightly consider'd. For whence can the Merit of any one's Sufferings (the Ground or Reason of their efficacy) flow but from the Dignity of his Person? And according to the true worth of that, the value of the other will rise, and must be rated. And so the infinite Preciousness in our LORD's Sufferings, argues no less than infinite Excellency, or perfect DIVINITY in his Nature. Which again renders his Sufferings so meritorious, as to become the means of our reconciliation to GOD.

As rational Creatures by ill Government and disobliging Carriage, may create Differences amongst themselves; so by perversity and sinfull behaviour they may contract enmity to GOD, and settle in it. And if once that sad enmity turns to aversion from him

as it commonly does ; what possibility of concord or amity can there be between *Him* and *them* while that continues ? Yet thus it was with *us*. We had so far deprav'd the original Constitution of our Nature, as to make it opposite to GOD's ; and incapable of meet application *to*, or communion *with* Him. So incapable, that all endeavours on our part, tho' never so earnest and incessant, would have been vain and ineffectual. We might as soon have perswaded the *Poles* of the World to meet and unite ; or have fixt a dear *Friendship* between the most rank and spiteful *Antipathies* : as have wrought our selves into agreement with the ALMIGHTY. But what *we* could not do, GOD did by CHRIST : GOD *was in* CHRIST reconciling the World unto himself, 2 Cor. 5. 19. But when it was in CHRIST suffering on the Cross : that he might reconcile both unto GOD in one body by the Cross, Eph. 2. 16. And it pleased the FATHER that having made peace by the Blood of the Cross, by him to reconcile all things to Himself, Col. 1. 20.

So that tho' before there was rueful Difference between GOD and *us* ; yet now the wide and gaping Breach by the Satisfaction of CHRIST's Sufferings was happily made up. And many holy Texts both in the Old and New Testament witness as much, tho' I cite but one out of each. Thus it is said, that he was wounded for our Transgressions, he was

bruised for our Iniquities ; the Chastisement of our peace was upon him, and with his stripes we are healed, Isai. 53. 5. And that he is the propitiation for our Sins ; and not for ours only, but also for the Sins of the whole World 1 S. John 2. 2.

Now what do these and a Number of other like Expressions import less (to such as will take them in their natural meaning) than that our Sins were the *impulsive Cause* (not the *Final* only, as *Socinus* phantasied) of CHRIST's Passion? And so that His Sufferings and Death were to *satisfy for them*, and to expiate our Guilt; for whose sake, in whose stead, and also in whose Nature he did suffer and die.

But then were CHRIST no more than a Man, how could his Death be so propitiatory to GOD, as to pacify Him towards us, by appeasing his Wrath and satisfying his Justice? Or to reconcile us to Him, by abolishing our Filth, and obtaining his Favour?

Alas! what is one Man's Blood, to the whole World's Sin? In Micah's Opinion (and a Prophet's Judgment should weigh with us) the *first born* (tho' commonly dearest and most set by) is no competent Offering for the Father's Trespas. (a) *Shall I give my First-born for my Transgression? the Fruit of my Body for the Sin of my Soul? That,* the very Question insinuates, (a form where

(a) Mic. 6. 7.

by Scripture *denies vehemently*) would be a most vain and foolish Attempt. And if the Death of one Man can't put away the Guilt of another; how should *one Man's Death* make atonement for *all Mens Sin*?

Nay, to go as far here as the Case will bear; were all the Blood of the *whole Body* of Mankind shed to cleanse one poor Delinquent from his Iniquity; I appeal to the Wise, and let them say, if it could be done. For what could there be in such a sanguine Stream to purify a defiled *Soul*? That *Human Blood* should clear a *Spirit* from moral Stains, is so vain a thought; that *Reason* and *Philosophy* plainly confute it. For according to *them* no *natural Cause* by its *own force*, can produce a *supernatural effect*. For so it must rise in strength above it self, and act beyond its power and capacity. Which to suppose, besides being absurd, is to assert an impossibility. CHRIST therefore was *more than Man*, else his Blood could never have been, what we are assur'd from heaven it was, a Propitiation for the Sins of the whole World. Which consider'd, I may well conclude this Argument with great *Origen's Question*. (b) *Who is so able to save, and to lead the Soul of Man to GOD, as GOD the WORD?*

(b) Τίς δ' ἄλλος σώσαι καὶ προσάγαγεν πρὸς πάντας
θεῶν δύναται τὴν τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ ψυχὴν, ἢ ὁ ΘΕΟΣ ΛΟΓΟΣ;
Con. Cel. li. 6.

And that He was GOD, will farther appear in the *Tenth* place, *from the Acceptableness and Usefulness of the Jewish Sacrifices.* In the *Fiftieth Psalm*, and the *Sixth of Micah*, 'tis obvious to note, that the *Materials* of those *Sacrifices*, tho' valuable with Men, were little esteem'd by GOD. For whether they were *Bullocks, Calves, Goats, Wild Beasts, or Fowls* in greatest Plenty; or else *Rivers of Oil*, and even *thousands*, or *ten thousands* of those *Rivers*: he made little account of them. And for a very good reason there suggested; (b) *the World is mine and the fulness thereof.* So that whatever Creatures they gave to GOD, they presented him but with *his own*, which could be no manner of favour or obligation.

Yet remarkable it is, that the *legal Offerings and Sacrifices* rightly perform'd, were very acceptable to GOD, and *useful* to Men. And therefore the royal Prophet begged that his *Spiritual Devotions* might be but like *those*, as to acceptance, and efficacy. *Let my Prayer be set forth before Thee as Incense, and the lifting up of my hands, as the Evening Sacrifice, Psal. 141. 2.* But then what made them so pleasing to, and prevalent with GOD when in themselves they were so worthless? I answer, the *relation* they had to CHRIST, to whom they led, and where they termina-

(b) Psal. 50. 12.

ted. For they were all but Types and Shadows of *him*, who was the grand Archetype, and common Substance of them all. So the Lamb appointed for the daily Morning and Evening sacrifice, prefigur'd *him*, the Lamb slain (in GOD's purpose) *from the Beginning of the World*. And *that* kill'd at the solemn Pasch, pointed as directly, at CHRIST our Passover sacrific'd for us. And these Sacrifices being prescrib'd by GOD, and thus related to CHRIST, and so propitiatory for us; they must signify (and were intended to do so) that the Sufferings of our LORD were to expiate our Sins: and then so far as they were Indications of *that*, they were Arguments of his DEITY. For how could the Sufferings of any but one *most Divine*, be of such immense worth and efficacy, as to do away all Mens sins? Yet of such a force might the Passion of CHRIST well be; if we do but consider, that when he was crucifix'd, the Blood of GOD was shed for us: for the Church he purchased with his own Blood, Act. 20. 28. And truly if the Blood of CHRIST had not been the Blood of GOD, how could it have been a valuable Price for so high a Purchase?

Socinus indeed, who denies CHRIST's DIVINITY, and so rejects his Satisfaction; makes our Salvation to depend mainly upon his Example. And seems to lay almost as great stress upon *that*, as we do upon his

Merits ; but that's more than it can bear. That He was our great *Exemplar* we can't deny, as having his own word for it. *I have given you an Example, that ye should do as I have done*, S. John 13. 15. And his first Apostle attests as much ; *He hath left us an Example, that we should follow his Steps*, 1 S. Pet. 2. 21. And as the proper Scope or End of an Example is to *imitate* it ; and as *that* was our LORD's drift in giving us *his* : so none less is signifi'd by the express terms in the cited Texts. That us'd by our SAVIOUR signifies (c) *premonstration*, or his going before ; to shew how we should follow Him to our power, treading in his Steps. S. Peter's word signifies (d) *a Copy* ; intimating we should conform to CHRIST as strictly, as we would carefully write after a Copy that is set us. And good reason, He being that *Fair prescript*, or exact *Rule* we are to go by.

But that CHRIST should save Men by his *Example chiefly* ; is quite *impossible*. For Example can have no influence but where it is *exhibited* : which CHRIST's was not till the World had stood several thousands of years. And so how could those in the *old* World before the Flood, and in the *former* Period of this *newer* one, receive *benefit from*, much less *Salvation by it* ? Yet in Scripture he's call'd *the Saviour of the World*, and *the Saviour*

(c) ὑπόδειγμα.

(d) ὑπόγραμμα.

our of all Men. But if he was to be so mainly by his *Example*, how shall any be sav'd that never had it? and that never had the least account of it? And then if he was the Saviour of Patriarchs, Prophets, and other good People of old; as according to Scripture he must be: how could he save them but by his *Blood and Merits*? The efficacy of which might reach as well to *them* before *His Death*; as now it does to *us* after *His Passion*.

And therefore to think rightly in this case, we must conclude; that besides affording us his glorious *Pattern* to invite us to Piety; he was deeply concern'd in *expiating* our Sins. And therefore the Word from Heaven plainly tells us, that *we are Redeemed by his Blood*, 1 S. Pet. 1. 19; *Justified by his Blood*, Rom. 5. 9; and *Sanctified by his Blood*, Heb. 13. 12. It tells us moreover that he was made a *Price*, a *Ransom*, a *Sacrifice* for us; and a *Propitiation* for our Sins by dying as he did. Now when Scripture affirms all this of CHRIST, and a great deal more of the same nature; if we look but to the common signification of the words, they must needs imply that our LORD did die to other great Ends besides that of being an *Example* to us. And for these *two* Reasons we must allow he *did* so. That the HOLY GHOST, and his *Pen-men* may *speak properly* of our LORD's Sufferings. And that we may be able to *reconcile Scripture Language to Truth and Sense*.

But

But then grant but this, that CHRIST according to the propriety of the Words, was a *Ransom*, a *Sacrifice*, and *Propitiation* for us and our *Sins* : and then as the efficacy of his *Sufferings* will evidence his DEITY, so his GODHEAD will render His Merits infinite. And then by them how easily and happily might the great Differences between GOD and Men, be eternally adjusted and made up? Whereas were CHRIST to have been an Example only, as *that* could have influenc'd none *before his Nativity* ; so tho' to Christians it might be a *Motive to do well*, yet what should have made amends for our high *Transgressions*?

The *Eleventh* Proof of CHRIST's DIVINITY, shall be his *Union with the FATHER*. This *Union* he Himself owns and openly declares, S. *John* 10. 30. *I and my FATHER are one*. The true meaning of which words the Jews immediately apprehended. And as they took them in their right sense, so they signifi'd as much at the 33th verse : *thou being a Man makest thy self GOD*. And he certainly intended that from what he said, they should learn to think and believe no less. And therefore when they told him *he made himself GOD* by what he spake, he *found no fault* with them for it ; but by silence gave consent to what they suggested : a *good sign* they were in the right. And therefore when for want of Faith, they were ready to stone him for

the *Truth* he asserted; instead of *retracting* he immediately *confirm'd* it by a strenuous Argument, v. 38th; *the FATHER is in me, and I in him.* An Expression which naturally and plainly signifies, that in the most Glorious FATHER and SON, there is an *Identity of Nature*, and *Unity of Essence*. Tho' withal it evidently shews the diversity, or *distinction* of their PERSONS, in as much as *no one can be in himself.* Yet still they might both be Essentially one; and the *Jews* could not think he meant otherwise. And therefore his uttering these words (which they thought equivalent to those in the 30th verse) put them into a fresh Ferment, and that occasion'd a new Mutiny in which they would have seiz'd him a second time. *Therefore they sought again to take him, but he escaped out of their hands, v. 39th.*

A clear Argument of our LORD's DIVINITY, tho' by it the *Jews* would not be convinc'd. For when, or where did any *sincerely good Man*, ever speak such a word as this since the World stood? Did any Patriarch, Prophet, High-priest, Apostle, King, or Emperor that professed the true Religion, ever claim *Union* with the DEITY, or own and maintain that GOD and he was *one*? How can we imagine then that the meek and humble, the most holy and incomparable JESUS should *challenge* that divinest Honour, if it were not His *Due*? Yet this,

this, we see, he did not only *claim*, but *insist* upon, and *dispute* for; and which is more, he *appeal'd* to his *Miracles* as a cogent *Proof* of it, and as a proper means to let the *Jews* into knowledge of the same, *v. 38th.* *Believe the works, tho' ye believe not me; that ye may know and believe that the FATHER is in me, and I in him.* And the same Argument he us'd to convince *Philip* of the same Truth, *S. John 14. 11.* And must it not then *most certainly* be so?

It may be not, perhaps some will say; we rather think it is *quite otherwise*, and have *reason* to do so for what fell from *CHRIST's* own Mouth, *S. John 17. 21.* *That they all may be one, as Thou FATHER art in me, and I in Thee; that they also may be one in us.* Now, may Objectors say, it does not follow from hence, that *all* the *LORD* spake of, were either *essentially one* themselves; or that they were so *one* with the *FATHER* and the *SON*. And therefore when He said, *I and the FATHER are one; and I am in the FATHER, and the FATHER in me:* this needs not imply that they two are one in *Essence* neither. I answer. Our *REDEEMER* in the words cited, prays that all Believers in Communion with his *FATHER* and him, may be *one*; that is in Faith and Doctrine, in Peace and Love, and in Christian Unity and Agreement; as His *FATHER* and He are one in perpetual heavenly Accord. But
what's

what's this as to hindring those Expressions in *S. John* the 10th, from signifying the **FATHER's** and **SON's** *Essential Union*? Especially when this remarkable *Circumstance* authenticates those Expressions, and makes them clearer Proofs still of *that their Union*: namely, that they were our **LORD's** direct and explicit answer to the *Jews*, when *they came round about him*, and importun'd him to hold them no longer in *suspence*, but to tell them *plainly* if he were the **CHRIST**; *S. Joh.* 10. 24; *The Jews came round about him, and said unto him, how long dost Thou make us to doubt? If Thou be the CHRIST, tell us plainly.* Then it was, and in answer to this their Request, that he voucht himself to be **Christ** by saying presently, *I and my FATHER are one.* Which was equivalent to telling them he was **GOD's SON** in the strictest sense. And therefore for speaking those words to them he owns at the 36th verse, *I said, I am the SON of GOD.* (which as we find in *S. Mat.* 26. 63. the *Jews* understood **CHRIST** should be.) And then to clinch the thing, he did not only affirm, *the FATHER is in me, and I in Him*: but that they might know and own as much, he advis'd them to credit his *Miracles*, which would be sure Testimonies of that grand Truth, and help to establish them in the belief of it. *Tho' ye believe not me, believe the works; that ye may know and believe that*
the

174 *An Antidote against Arianism.*

the FATHER is in me, and I in him,
v. 38th.

Now can any be so weak as to phanfy, that the SON of GOD wrought Miracles to make us believe there is an amicable Union between his FATHER and Him? As if GOD and his SON were at such distance and enmity, that Miracles only could perswade us they agree; and that He appeal'd to *them* for the proof of *that*. Yet they who would not be so silly and senseless, must think he wrought them to induce Men to believe their Essential Unity: or at least due consideration of them might ascertain the thing to them. And *that* indeed being more difficult to be believ'd, Miracles might there be more reasonably us'd to help our Faith. And then I may note, that *those* Miracles which S. John reports in the Chapters of his Gospel preceeding this Tenth, may be very corroborative of our Faith in reference to *that* Article. For he gives account of CHRIST's turning Water into Wine. Of his telling the Samaritan Woman all things that ever she did. Of his healing the impotent Man diseased eight and thirty Years. Of his feeding five thousand with five Loaves and two small Fishes; of which after they had eaten as much as they would, there remained twelve Baskets full of Fragments. And of his restoring a Man to sight who was born Blind. Now these Miracles (besides numbers of others) being wrought by his Power;

Power; they that saw them might be well assur'd, that when he said he was *the SON of GOD*, and *one with the FATHER*; he spake the truth in the strictest and highest sense. For who but such an one, by his proper Might could have done those Glorious Wonders? Tho' what Men of sense can possibly imagine, that so *many* and such mighty Wonders should be done, to convince us that GOD and his only SON live in love, and peace, and unity together?

And indeed when he declar'd, *I and my FATHER are one*: those two words, *ἐν ἑαυτῷ*, *we are one*; do not only intimate, but plainly signify their *Oneness*: not in *Concord* but in *Nature*, and *Essence*. For as we truly imports that they are two distinctly as *PERSONS*: so *one*, implies their natural *Unity* as strongly in *ESSENCE*. How agreeable then are (c) *Athenagoras's* words, where he speaks of *the FATHER's and the SON's being one*; and of *the SON's being in the FATHER*, and *the FATHER in the SON*, by the *Unity and Power of the SPIRIT*? Most properly exprest. For the *FATHER* and the *SON*, Two *VITALITIES* in the *DEITY*, being both in that Infinite *SPIRIT*, which is the *Substance* or *Essence* of it; they must needs be one by virtue of *its* Unity: One, that is,

(c) Legat. pro Christian. Ἐνὸς ὄντος τῷ ΠΑΤΡΟΣ καὶ τῷ Υἱῷ: ὅτι καὶ τῷ Υἱῷ ἐν ΠΑΤΡΙ, ΠΑΤΡΟΣ ἐν Υἱῷ, ἐνότητι καὶ συνάμει Πνεύματος.

Substantially, or Essentially, as they are in one and the same Substance or Essence.

To *Athenagoras's* Words, I shall add *Tertullian's*, which may pass for a *Comment* on this short Text; *I and my FATHER are one.* In reference to which he speaks thus to *Praxeus*. (f) *But here now fools will make a stand, yea, and the blind who can't see first, I and my FATHER signifies two. Secondly, that are signifies not a single person, as being a plural word. And then moreover, that We are one [that is one thing] not we are one [that is one person] For if He had said we are one [as to person] He might have further'd their Opinion. For one, of the singular Number [and masculine Gender] signifies a single [person.] Yet when he affirms two of the Masculine Gender, to be one by a neutral word, that belongs not to singularity [of person] but to Unity [of Essence.] And by and by, by saying, I and my FATHER are one, he shews they are two, which he makes equal and joins together. By which Writers we may plainly see what early Antiquity thought of the SON*

(f) *Hic ergo jam gradum volunt figere stulti, imò cœci qui non videant, primo, ego & pater duorum esse significationem. Dehinc in novissimo, sumus, non ex unius esse persona, quod pluraliter dictum est. Tum, quod unum sumus, non unus sumus. Si enim dixisset quod unus sumus, potuisset adjuvare sententiam illorum. Unus enim singularis numeri significatio videtur. Adhuc cùm duo masculini generis, unum dicit neutrali verbo, quod non pertinet ad singularitatem, sed ad Unitatem.*

of GOD. I mean, how they believ'd *his Divinity*, and argu'd for it by *His Unity* with the FATHER. I proceed to

A *Twelfth* Proof of it, which may be, *his Equality with GOD*. We find it in *Phil.* 2. 6. Where the HOLY GHOST affirms of CHRIST, that *He thought it not Robbery to be equal with GOD*. And if he thought it no usurpation or incroachment upon GOD, no injury to, or detraction from him, to be *his Equal*: it must be because he *really is so*. And if he be so truly and compleatly, he must be GOD as much as GOD Himself is; else he can't have perfect *Equality* with Him. And if he has not, to claim it would be to rob him of his Right. So that construe the words fairly, and that will bring the point to this issue. Either that CHRIST JESUS must be *equal* with the FATHER in *Nature and Dignity*; or else he must entertain a thought infinitely *arrogant* as to *himself*, and to his FATHER as *derogatory* and *affronting*. For be a *Creature* never so incomparable, yet to think himself *Equal* with GOD, must be a most grievous and intolerable presumption: a Sin so dreadful that any common upright Christian would tremble to commit it. And then supposing CHRIST in Excellency above all other Men (as he must be were he *but* a Man;). His aversion from, and abhorrence of it, must needs be answerable to his surpassing Goodness; and so what
N could

could ever tempt him to it? When therefore he *thought* himself *equal* with GOD, He must certainly *be* so. Were it demanded how the PERSONS in the GODHEAD are *Equal*? I would answer, in *PERFECTION*. For every of them being truly and naturally GOD, they must all be *infinitely Perfect*, and then how can one *Infinite* surpass another, unless it be in relative *Order*? For tho' the *Three* are all infinitely Perfect; yet the infinitely Perfect FATHER must have the pre-eminence of the infinitely Perfect SON, by reason of his *Begetting* Him: and the infinitely Perfect FATHER and SON, must be before the infinitely Perfect SPIRIT, by virtue of their *Spiration* of Him. And thus much our LORD Himself signifies, *S. Joh. 14. 28. My FATHER is Greater than I.* Implying there is *μεγαλεις* *Inc.* a *Grandeur*, Magnificence, or Nobility in the *first*, upon account of *Paternity*; which is not in the *Second*. And therefore (a) *Origen* pronounces the SON, *ὑποτάσσον*, *inferior to the FATHER* meaning in *Order* only. For at the same time he declares him *ἐκ ἰσότητος*, *not stronger than He.* And what *Origen* intimates of the SON's Inferiority, *Tertullian* suggests the same, and also notes the HOLY GHOST's gradual Subordination to them both. *S. Exposit. of Artic. 18th.*

(a) *Cont. Cel. li. 8. p. 388.*

The words are very observable also which
suber in them last spoken to; who being in
the Form of GOD. And from these I might
draw farther Evidence for CHRIST's Equality
with the FATHER. For (g) *Form*, accor-
ding to *Phavorinus*, is properly the *Essence*.
And by learned Expositors is made synony-
mous with (h) *Nature*. And so again to the
FATHER he must be equal, as being of
the same *Nature* with him; which he retained
when he was lowest. For as that holy and
learned Author says, (i) *he did not so take*
the Form of a Servant, as that he should lose the
Form of GOD, wherein he was equal to the
FATHER. And if we'll believe *Damascene*,
he tells us (in his *Isagoge*, chap. 1.) εἶσα ἡ
οὐσία ἡ φύσις κατὰ τοὺς ἁγίους πατέρας, ταὐτὸ
ἐστίν: that *Essence, Nature, and Form, according*
to the holy Fathers, are but the same thing.

To prove that *Form* is *Nature*, we may
consider; that when of CHRIST 'tis said
there, he took upon him the *form* of a Ser-
vant, it was not meant that he assum'd the
same *Shape*, or *Appearance* of a Servant only; but
his true *Nature*, or *Quality*. Indeed in the
context, he's said to be made (k) *in the*
likeness of Men; and to be found in (l) *fashion*

(g) Μορφή κυρίου ἢ εἶσα.

(h) Φύσις.

(i) Neq; sic accepit formam Servi, ut amitteret formam
in qua erat æqualis PATRI. S. August. De TRINIT.
1. cap. 7.

(k) Ἐν ὁμοιωµατί.

(l) Ἐν ὁµοιότητι.

as a Man ; as if he were a Man in *show*, or *figure* only, as some have phansy'd : but yet at the same time he was a perfect Man in all respects. And therefore he is called *this Man* Act. 13. 38 ; and again, *Heb.* 10. 12 ; and *the Man CHRIST JESUS*, 1 Tim. 2. 5 : as being so far even of *our Order*. And if his *taking the form of a Servant*, signifies his taking a *Servant's Nature*, as well as his *Condition* ; which he truly did : why should not his being in the *Form of GOD*, as well signify his being *GOD naturally and essentially* ?

Beza therefore rightly asserts, *That is the magnificent MAJESTY and GLORY of the DEITY, which (m) is the GODHEAD IN SELF, that is called the FORM of GOD*. And then adds, *(n) that all the Ancients as well Greek as Latin, by the FETTER of GOD have with perfect and perpetual Consent, understood the DEITY of the SON to be meant and by the form of a Servant, the humane Nature assumed by the WORD.*

As a *Thirteenth Argument for CHRIST DIVINITY*, I offer *his Eternal Empire or Dominion*. And that *His* is indefeibly such, we are assur'd from Heaven : *Thy Throne, O GOD is for ever, and ever, Psal.* 45. 6. And that

(m) Forma DEI dicitur augusta illa DEITATIS Majestas ac Gloria, quæ est ipsamet DEITAS. Annot. larg. in loc.

(n) Veteres omnes tam Græci, tam Latini summo perpetuo consensu, per formam DEI, Deitatem FILII ; per formam servi, humanam naturam a VERBO sumptam intellexerunt. Id. ib.

CHRIST is GOD here meant, is clear from Heb. 1. 8. *But unto the SON he saith, Thy Throne, O GOD, is for ever, and ever.* As we read in 1 Tim. 1. 17. *The King eternal, immortal, is part of the Title of the only Wise, Who is the only True GOD.* And tho' it be compatible to none but GOD, yet GOD Himself here gives it to CHRIST in effect; for what is GOD *intron'd for ever, but the King Eternal, and Immortal?* And must not CHRIST be GOD then?

Had CHRIST been no where stil'd GOD in Scripture, what an *Objection* would that have been against us who hold his DEITY? and how vehemently should it have been urged? But then the only Wise GOD who cannot err, having thus declar'd him GOD openly, and expressly given him such a *Partnership* in his *own Title*; must not this be an *Argument* as strong and conclusive on our side?

But Here's *farther Evidence* of his DIVINITY still. For as to the Throne, or Dominion of his *Messiahship*; *the Spiritual Administration, or Government of his Church*; that shall fail, or have an end: it shall cease and terminate with this World. For then *he shall deliver up the Kingdom to GOD even the FATHER*, 1 Cor. 15. 24. And so his *Throne for ever and ever*, must mean his *Empire Divine*, as he is truly GOD; the other being but *temporary*.

And to ascertain *that his Dominion* is everlasting, as far as proper Words need fairly make it; His Throne is said by the Psalmist to be (o) *Olam vaedh, for ever and ever*. Whereby *Eternity* is as well exprest, as by (p) *Natsach, Kedhem*, or any other word us'd by the Hebrews. And when a thing is utter'd by the *propereſt Terms* a Language has what can be expected or desired more? Yet so fully is CHRIST's *Regality* set forth to be everlasting by the words mention'd; that even GOD the FATHER's is exprest'd by the very same, *Pſal. 10. 16. the LORD is King, Olam vaedh, for ever and ever*. I dismiss this Text therefore with what (q) *Justin Martyr* says of it, and of some others cited by him in the same Paragraph, relating to CHRIST'S DIVINITY. *That he is to be worſhip't, and is GOD*, these very words expressly signify.

The *Fourteenth Argument* for CHRIST'S DEITY, shall be *His Ubiquity*. It is a common saying amongst the Jews, that *where two sit and have between them the words of the Law*, the *Shechinah*, or *Divine Presence* is between them likewise. An high Privilege; but upon his Profelytes our LORD has settl'd the very same, where-ever they meet and join in his Worship. For *where two or three are gathered together in my name*, says he, *there will*

(o) *עולם ועד.* (p) *נצח קדמ.*

(q) *Ὅτι γὰρ καὶ προσκύνουσιν ἐστὶ καὶ θεός. . . αὐτὸς δὲ
ἔστι διαφέρων σημαίνου.* Dialog. cum Tryph.

I be in the midst of them, S. Mat. 18. 20. And as he thus engag'd to be with them at all times, and in all places, to assist and bless them in proper ways, and sutable measures : so the ingagement he will make good. But now supposing him a *meer Man*, how he should apply to us *all at once* will be hard to conceive, and impossible to be done. *Really* present to all he must be, else his Promise fails ; and as solemn as his Word seems, it will be false and deceitful. And if he be present *really*, he must be so *corporally*, or *spiritually*. *Corporally* present he can't be, it being inconsistent with the *Nature* of a Body to be but in *two* distant places at once. And if he be present *Spiritually*, in a manner so general and extensive, it must be by virtue of *Omnipresence*. And that being compatible to GOD only, in case it be one of CHRIST's Attributes, *he* must be GOD too.

And that he certainly is so, will appear in the *next place* ; from his *Hearing and Answering Prayers*. *O Thou that hearest Prayers* (said the King of Israel to GOD) *unto Thee shall all flesh come, Psal. 65. 2.* And to hear Prayers may well be GOD's sole *Prerogative* ; when to *answer* them is only in his *Power*. Yet this *Prerogative* peculiar to GOD, CHRIST challenges to Himself. For to all that are His he declares ; *Whatsoever ye shall ask in my Name, that will I do : if you ask any thing in my Name, I will do it, S. Joh. 14.*

13, 14. And however some conjecture, that the latter verse is but a redundancy crept out of the Margent into the Text ; we may rather conclude it is an elegant and useful *Anadiplosis*, or repeated Assertion confirming the Truth that our LORD spake, and assuring us he has power to do what he promis'd. And to this (r) *Grotius* assents.

But then I must demand, what meer Man, in the highest pitch of elevation that his Nature is capable of, can be able to attend at once to the various Petitions of Myriads of Supplicants? Especially when they are in so many and distant Places, and under so many and different Wants, and Pressures? Which is the true Case. Here to succour Numberless Numbers that are *Sick*, there to relieve as many that are *Indigent*, and elsewhere to release as many that are *Oppress'd*; in a word, to be present *with*, and assistant *to* such as are in Studies, Labours, Troubles, Terrors, Dangers, Pains, Prisons, Persecutions, and other Miseries innumerable ; and so present *with*, and assistant *to* the Sufferers as to bless and sanctify their Hardships to them, till they be rescu'd from the same. Who but GOD can do this, or any thing like it? And therefore CHRIST having undertaken it, he can be no less.

(r) Repetit hoc ut magis spem eorum confirmet, quod ipsi adeo ipsis notus omnia effecta dandi sit habiturus potestatem in loc.

And here I must add, that as *Prayers* are directed to CHRIST, so are *Doxologies*, or *Forms of Praise* as well. Thus in *Heb.* 13. 21. *Thro' JESUS CHRIST, to whom be Glory for ever and ever, amen.* And in 2 *S. Pet.* 3. 18. *Our LORD and SAVIOUR JESUS CHRIST, to whom be Glory both now and for ever. Amen.* And in *Rev.* 5. 13. we find *every Creature in Heaven, and on the Earth, and under the Earth, and in the Sea, giving Blessing, Honour, Glory, and Power unto him that sitteth on the Throne, and to the LAMB for ever and ever.* And when all Creatures in the Universe conspire or unite in the highest general Adoration they can yield; and direct it as much to the LAMB, or SON of GOD; as to the FATHER Himself: what does this Equality of *Worship* done to both alike signify, but that *their Nature is the same*? Especially when the HOLY GHOST has so expressly recorded it; which shews it equally grateful, and so equally *Due* to Both the PERSONS; as well to the LAMB, as to *Him upon the Throne.*

Another Proof of CHRIST's DEITY, shall be *his Dispensing Divine Favours in concert with the other PERSONS of the HOLY TRIAD.* And therefore when *St. Paul* pray'd for such Favours to Christians; he apply'd to those Sacred THREE for them. *The Grace of our LORD JESUS CHRIST, and the Love of GOD, and the Communion of the HOLY GHOST,*

186 *An Antidote against Arianism.*

GHOST, be with you all. Amen. 2 Cor. 13. ult. Where it is obvious to note, that in token the Three VITALITIES or living Hypostases who join in conferring Divine Favours upon us are all *Equal* in their Perfections; S. Paul mentions the SON First, by his other Titles. And when from the Order in which the HOLY THREE here stand I argue them all to be equally *Divine*; I do but imitate the great S. Jerome. For upon that Text his Comment is this. *Contra Arianos, qui ideo PATREM majorem esse contendunt; quia plerumq; primus nominatur in ordine. This lies against the Ariens, who maintain the FATHER to be the greater; because He's most commonly nam'd first in order.*

And I may well note another thing here, very observable. That CHRIST did not only Dispense high Favours to his Church, but even the HOLY SPIRIT Himself. I will send the SPIRIT of Truth from the FATHER, S. John. 15. 26. And I will send Him unto you. chap. 16. 7. Thus our LORD promised. And that he did actually send him, the glorious effects of his Mission recorded in the Sacred Book, are ample Testimonies. But then does not this shew that CHRIST was GOD? For is it at all decent or tolerable, that a meer Man tho' never so advanced, should command the HOLY SPIRIT of GOD? that he should send him when and where, and how, and to whom he thinks

fit?

fit? This would no way comport with the exceeding tenuity of the meanest rational Creature that ever the great GOD made; and the Divineſt SPIRIT's infinite Dignity, and Perfection.

Again, (to uſe another Argument) CHRIST's DIVINITY is evident, from *his averring it to the Jewish High-prieſt*. I mean, in S. Mat. 26. 64. JESUS ſaith unto him, *Thou haſt ſaid*. The High Prieſt being deſirous to know whether he were the *true Meſſiah*, who he knew was to be GOD's SON; and finding him backward to diſcover Himſelf: he put (s) *the Oath of execration* upon him, ſaying, *I adjure thee by the living GOD, that thou tell us whether thou be CHRIST the SON of GOD*. And thus our LORD was neceſſitated to ſpeak the truth, as much as an Oath obliges us Chriſtians to do it. And he being under this force, tho' before he was ſilent, now he ſpeaks plainly and to the purpoſe; for he ſaith unto him, *thou haſt ſaid: or ſo I am*. And that this he own'd poſitively, is recorded more than once. For when he was aſk'd by the High-prieſt, in the 14th of St. Mark, *art thou CHRIST the SON of THE BLESSED?* JESUS answered and ſaid, *I am*. And when the Elders of the People, and the chief Prieſts, and the Scribes demanded of him, *art thou the SON of GOD?* He ſaid un-

(s) שביעה תאלה

to them, ye say that I am, S. Luke 22. 70. And so we have the authentick Testimony of CHRIST Himself, who is *Truth* it self to confirm his own DIVINITY. And thus the point is brought to this Head in short. If CHRIST when adjur'd by the High-priest to speak the truth, did in that circumstance affirm he was the SON of GOD (as 'tis manifest he did) he must *really* be so, or else must be a *perjur'd wretch*; which what Christian does not abhor to think?

And when the solemn Question, *art thou the SON of GOD?* was askt; we need not doubt but it was meant of his being GOD's SON in the *highest* Sense. For when CHRIST answer'd it on the Affirmative (because they did not believe it) (*t*) *the High-priest rent his Clothes*, and cry'd out of *Blasphemy*, and *all condemn'd him to be guilty of Death*. Now had the Question been whether he were GOD's *adoptive* SON? besides impertinence in proposing it, as the *Scrutiny* would not have been so *strict*, so the *answer* given could not have met with such deep and hot *resentments*; for he at *worst* then could have been but an *Hypocrite*, at the discovery of which, as *the High-priest* could not have cry'd out of *Blasphemy*, so he would not have *rent* his clothes neither, (which should he have done as oft as he discerned Peoples *Hypocrisy*, I fear he must have gone very

(t) S. Mark 14. 63, 64.

much in Raggs.) Evident it is therefore that the enquiry went upon his being GOD's SON truly and *naturally*. Only they not thinking he was so, made them take the Answer so hainously, tho' it was true.

But then the *Question* being so put, it will be needful to look a little narrowly if not *nicely* into the *Answer*; the better to clear up the weighty Problem. Here therefore we must consider, that the Answer our LORD return'd, must be either direct, or indirect.

If *direct* to the Querist's meaning, as we have great reason to believe; then when CHRIST reply'd to the High-priest, *thou hast said*, whose Question had respect to his being GOD's *Proper* SON: without more ado *he must be so in the strictest manner*. I mean, by eternal *Generation*, and so as much, or *more* than any Man can be the Son of an earthly Father. And then the Dispute is fairly at an end.

If his Answer were *Indirect*; then as it was *unworthy* of him, so it cannot be defended.

For 1st, the Enquirers sought to know and be satisfi'd *touching his natural Divine SONSHIP*. A Query of the highest Importance, as being of eternal Consequence. And therefore if he gave an Answer to it (as he did immediately) who can think it should be *indirect*? Especially when he came into the World to teach the *great Truths* of GOD;

GOD; and to suffer for Men's Happiness and Salvation.

2ly, He was now, as it were, upon Oath, and so oblig'd to speak *directly* and clearly; and so he did. And so indeed any good *Christian*, or honest *Man* must have done in the like case.

3ly, If he were not GOD's only SON in the *sublimest* way and quality, when he pretended to be so; he must have been guilty of an horrid Capital Sin, deserving death from the very *Jews*. For if a false Prophet was to die, *Deut.* 18. 20. then how much more a Counterfeit *Messiah*? Which had he been, the *Jews* complain'd justly to *Pilate*, *we have a Law, and by our Law he ought to die, because he made himself the SON of GOD*, *S. John* 19. 7. But pray what SON of GOD then could he mean he was, or could the *Jews* think he meant but his eternal SON? For had he been his regenerate SON only, neither could he have deserved *Death*, nor could the *Jews* have sought his Life for saying that by any *Law*.

4ly, He was now *just ready to die*, and to suffer a cruel and bitter *Death*, and he knew as much. And could any good *Man* think that a juncture to *dissemble* and *lye* in, and notoriously to *Blasphe*me? So that had *CHRIST* been but a Mortal of common Probability, he durst not have said he was GOD's SON in the *Jews* Sense. But he being the

SON

SON of GOD in the highest Notion and Capacity (as I have proved) and he plainly and publickly declaring even at that time that so he was: we have reason enough firmly to believe that so he is. Else He did not, nor He could not answer directly to the important *Interrogatory*: which yet He must do. For

Lastly, We know what the Sacred infallible Word says concerning him: *Who did no Sin, neither was guilt found in his Mouth.* And therefore when so plain and momentous a *Question* was put to him by the High-priest of the *Jewish* Nation in the Circumstances he was in then; we need not doubt but he answer'd it *sincerely*, according to the tenour and true *sense* of it. He must certainly do so, he could not possibly do otherwise; all fraud and collusion being as far from his Words, as Sin it self was from his Practice.

The last Argument for our LORD's DEITY, shall be *humane Testimonies*, or Authorities cited out of some Primitive Fathers who flourisht in the first three Centuries.

The first I bring in shall be out of the Writings of S. Ignatius. He begins his Epistle to them at *Smyrna* thus. (u) *I glorifie JESUS CHRIST GOD that made you so wise.*

(u) Δοξάζω ΙΗΣΟΥΝ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΝ Τὸν ΘΕΟΝ τὸν ἑταρὸς
 ὑμᾶς σοφίζοντα.

And presently speaking of our LORD, he pronounces him (w) *to be truly of the lineage of David according to the Flesh, and the SON of GOD according to the Will and Power of GOD.* Where truly, reaches to both Natures and Relations equally; and shews him to be as *truly GOD* in respect of the one, as he is *truly Flesh* in regard of the other. And when he calls CHRIST GOD, and glorifies him as GOD; are not these good tokens that he own'd his DIVINITY? I might also note, that in the same Epistle he affirms him to be *joined to the FATHER*: and indeed so joined to him, as to (x) *be one with him.*

And in his Epistle to Polycarp, towards the end of it he has this Expression: (y) *I pray in our GOD JESUS CHRIST.*

In his Epistle to the Ephesians he speaks thus of Him. (z) *There is one Physician carnal and spiritual, begotten and unbegotten, made in the Flesh, GOD in true immortal Life; both of Mary and of GOD.* And in another Paragraph of the same Epistle, of him he says, (a) *Nothing is hid from the LORD, but*

(w) Ἀληθῶς ὄντα ἐκ γένους Δαβὶδ κατὰ σὰρκα, υἱὸν ΘΕΟΥ κατὰ θέλημα καὶ δύναμιν ΘΕΟΥ. (x) ἡνωμένῳ.

(y) Ἐν ΘΕῳ ἡμῶν ἸΗΣΟΥ ΧΡΙΣΤῳ εὐχομαι.

(z) Εἰς Ἰατρός ἐστιν σαρκικός τε καὶ πνευματικός, γενετός καὶ ἀγένετος, ἐν σαρκὶ γενόμενος, ΘΕΟΣ ἐν ἀθανάτῳ ζωῇ ἀληθινή καὶ ἐκ Μαρίας καὶ ἐκ ΘΕΟΥ.

(a) Οὐδὲν λαθεῖναι τὸν κύριον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰ κρυπτά ἡμῶν ἐγγύς αὐτοῦ ἐσιν. Πάντα ἔν ποιούμεν ὡς αὐτὸ ἐν ὑμῖν κατεσκεύετο, ἵνα ὁμῶν αὐτὸ γαδὶ καὶ αὐτὸ. ἢ ἐν ἡμῖν ΘΕΟΣ ἡμῶν.

even

even our hidden things are near him : let us therefore do all things as having him dwelling in us, that we may be his Temples, and he in us may be our GOD. And by and by he declares, that (b) JESUS CHRIST our GOD was carry'd in the Womb of Mary. And soon after, that he was (c) GOD manifested like a Man. Little different from S. Paul's expression, (d) GOD was manifested in the Flesh. And in the same Epistle Ignatius speaks of our (e) receiving the knowledge of GOD, who is JESUS CHRIST. And in the very beginning of it he calls the Blood of CHRIST, (f) the Blood of GOD.

In his Epistle to the Magnesians he tells them that (g) the one GOD manifested himself by JESUS CHRIST his SON, who is his WORD. Οὐ ρητὸς, not a word spoken, ἀλλ' ἐνανθῶς, but an essential one : ὃ γὰρ ἐστὶ λαλιᾶς ἀνάρθρῳ φώνημα, it is not the voice of articulate speech ; ἀλλ' ἐνεργείας θεϊκῆς εἰσία γεννητῆ, but the begotten being of a Divine Energy. And a little before he calls him, Λόγῳ Θεός, αὐτογενὴς υἱός ; GOD the WORD, the only begotten SON. And soon after exhorts to

(b) Ὁ ΘΕΟΣ ἡμῶν ΙΗΣΟΥΣ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΣ ἐκυφορήθη ὑπὸ
μαρίας. (c) ΘΕΟΣ ἀνθρώπινως φαιερόμενός.

(d) 1 Tim. 3. 16.

(e) Λαβόντες ΘΕΟΤ' γινώσι, ὅτι ἐστὶ ΙΗΣΟΥΣ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΣ.

(f) Ἀναζωπυρήσαντες ἐν αἱματί ΘΕΟΤ'.

(g) Εἰς ΘΕΟΣ ἔστιν ὁ φανερώσας ἑαυτὸν διὰ ΙΗΣΟΥ
ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ ΤΟΥΤῆ Αὐτοῦ, ὅς ἐστιν Αὐτοῦ ΛΟΓΟΣ αἰδίδος.

faith in CHRIST JESUS. And if the SON were not GOD as well as the FATHER, why should he be made as much the *object* of *Christian Faith*, as he is? Tho' (by the way) what is more urged in the Gospel than *believing in CHRIST*? A sure sign he must be GOD; when *he is* *curst that trusteth in Man*, Jer. 17. 5.

In the close of his Epistle to the *Philadelphians*, he wishes the LORD JESUS CHRIST might honour them; *in (h) whom they hope with Flesh, Soul, Faith, Charity, Concord.* And who *is*, or ever *was*, or ever *can be* the *Object*, the *lawful Object* of such an Hope but the true GOD?

In his Epistle to the *Trallians* he minims them, that (i) *by believing in the Death of CHRIST JESUS they might avoid dying.* And he there gives substantial reason for the Virtue of such a Faith, and for the saving Efficacy of his Death: namely, that he (k) *the SON of the FATHER*; and so his Merit and Sufferings procure Pardon and Happiness for Sinners. Whereas (l) *without him*, as the Father says, *we have no life.*

(h) Εἰς ὃν ἐλπίζουσιν σαρκί, ψυχῇ, πίστι, ἀγάπῃ, ὁμολογίᾳ.

(i) ἵνα πισεύσαντες εἰς τὸν θάνατον αὐτοῦ τὸ ἀποθνήσκειν.

(k) Ὑἱος τοῦ Πατρὸς.

(l) Οὐ χωρὶς τοῦ ἀληθινοῦ ζῆν ἔχομεν.

An Antidote against Arianism. 195

Lastly, in his Epistle to the Romans, he thus expresseth himself. (m) *Suffer me to be an imitator of the Passion of CHRIST my GOD.* Meaning, in Dying for the Truth.

These Passages shew our LORD's DIVINITY in the Epistles of S. Ignatius. Of that Ignatius who (n) *owns he saw the LORD JESUS in the Flesh after his Resurrection.* Who lived familiarly with the Apostles, and drank of the spiritual Streams which flowed from them, says (o) St. Chrysostom. Who was thought worthy of the Bishoprick of Antioch, and was promoted to it by great Peter, according to (p) Theodoret) who by S. Jerome is call'd (q) *the Prince of the Apostles.* Of that Ignatius who laid down his Life in defence of the Christian Faith, being devour'd by Lions: and as he was going to Rome to be martyr'd there, wrote some of these Epistles in his Passage thither. So that we think seriously *who* he was, and *when* he liv'd, and *how* he died; these Considerations must add weight and strength to the Testimonies he gives of CHRIST's DIVINITY. Which being recorded by *him*, so ear- an Author, so good a Man, so sound a

(m) Ἐπιτελείτε μοι μιμήτην εἰς αἰπάθεος ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ ΤΟΥ ΘΕΟΥ ΜΕ.

(n) Ἐγὼ γὰρ καὶ μετὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν ἐν σαρκὶ αὐτὸν εἶδα.
ad Smyrn. (o) Hom. in S. Ignat.

(p) Διὰ τοῦ μεγάλου Πέτρου δεξιᾶς. Dialog. 1.

(q) Princeps Apostolorum. Catal. No. 1.

Christian, so great a Bishop, so eminent a Saint, and just going to be a glorious Martyr; what single humane Evidence can be expected or desired, more ancient, more clear, and so more cogent than *his* for our LORD's DEITY? For he calls him GOD expressly, and calls him so frequently, no fewer than *ten* times as has been noted, in his *Seven* short Epistles. And good reason when a Prophet call'd him so, *The mighty GOD*, *Isai.* 9. 6. And an Evangelist call'd him so, *GOD with us*, *S. Mat.* 1. 23. And an Apostle call'd him so, *My LORD*, and *my GOD*, *S. Joh.* 20. 28. And which is more than all, GOD Himself call'd him so *Thy Throne*, *O GOD*, *Heb.* 1. 8.

To oppose to all this, that *Moses* was made a GOD to *Pharaoh*; and so tho' CHRIST was called GOD, he may be so no more than *He*: would be a vain Objection. For that great Man was said to be a GOD with manifest *restriction*; to *one Person*, that is, the King of *Egypt*; in *one case*, to humble and destroy him; and for *one End*, or Purpose, to deliver *Israel* out of Bondage. And therefore *Onkelos* renders *Elohim*, GOD there, אלהים a Grandee, or Prince, or Potentate to *Pharaoh*, to plague or punish him. And *Jonathan* interprets it the fear or dread of *Pharaoh*, as he was to denounce dreadful Judgments against him, and to doom him to dismal Severities. But did any Jew, or Christian

stian, or Egyptian either; ever think *Moses* to be *the more* a GOD, for what was so declar'd concerning him? Indeed the Name *Elohim* given *absolutely* to any one, points directly at GOD Himself, and can be so used of no other. And therefore being used of CHRIST without limitation, as it is in *Psal.* 45. 6; it signifies he is perfect GOD. But where was *Moses* call'd GOD but *once*? Tho' CHRIST has been all along so denominated, both by Inspir'd Writers, and other Christian ones in General. But no *Jewish* Authors, no, not one of them ever durst do great *Moses* that honour.

Having done with St. Ignatius, the next ancient Writer I mention shall be *Athenagoras*. And tho' out of him I shall take but one short Excerption, yet so pregnant will it be, as to attest the Being of the TRINITY in UNITY, with the same force and clearness, that it does our SAVIOUR's DEITY. It is this. (r) *Who would not be concern'd to hear that they should be call'd Atheists, that so hold there is GOD the FATHER, GOD the SON, and the HOLY GHOST; as to explain the strictness of their Unity, and the Distinction of their Order?*

(r) Τίς ἔν ἐκ αὐτῶν ἀπορήσαι, λέγοντας ΘΕΟΝ ΠΑΤΕΡΑ καὶ ΥἱΟΝ ΘΕΟΝ καὶ ΠΝΕΥΜΑ ἍΓΙΟΝ, δεικνύντας αὐτῶν καὶ τὴν ἐν τῇ ἐνάσει δύναμιν, καὶ τὴν ἐν τῇ τάξει διαίρεσιν, αἰκούσας ἀθεοὺς καλούμενας; Legat. pro Christ.

The Third Author of great and high worth shall be *Justin Martyr*. Who making mention (s) of the LOGOS formed and made Man, and called JESUS; thus expresseth himself. (t) And besides the common Generation, we say, he was peculiarly begotten of GOD, the LOGOS of GOD. And tho' by and by he declares, that (u) the LOGOS is the SON according to the FATHER and LORD GOD of the Universe; yet he adds, being incarnate he was made Man. And (w) elsewhere he affirms, that he is both GOD, and the Messenger sent from the FATHER. And soon after, (x) CHRIST the LORD and GOD, is the SON of GOD. And again (to add no more Testimonies of his, tho' very many might be alledg'd) he declares, that he (y) is GOD to be adored, and CHRIST. *Tatianus* also his Contemporary, speaking of the HOLY GHOST, call him τὸν Διακόνον τῷ ποιῶντι θεοῦ: the Minister of GOD who suffer'd, meaning CHRIST.

(s) τῷ ΛΟΓΩΙ μορφωθέντι καὶ ἀνθρώπῳ γενόμενῳ, καὶ ἸΗΣΟΥ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ κληθέντι. *Apol. 2.*

(t) Καὶ ἰδίως παρὰ τὴν κοινὴν γένεσιν γεγενῆσθαι αὐτὸν ἰσθῆναι θεοῦ λέγομεν, ΛΟΓΟΝ θεοῦ. *Ib.*

(u) Μετὰ Πατέρα πάντων καὶ Δεσπότην θεὸν τῶν λόγων ἐστίν. *Ib.*

(w) Ὁ αὐτὸς ὢν καὶ θεός, καὶ Ἄγγελος παρὰ τῷ Πατρὶ πεπεμμένος. *Dialog. cum Tryph.*

(x) ΚΥΡΙΟΣ ὁ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΣ, καὶ θεός, θεὸς τῶν ὑπαρχόντων.

(y) Προσκυνητός ἐστι καὶ θεός, καὶ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΣ.

The

The next famous Writer a good Witness, of this great Truth, shall be *Clement of Alexandria*. He tells us that our *Schoolmaster*, meaning CHRIST, is not only the SON of GOD, and like his FATHER, (z) but GOD in the likeness of Man, the LOGOS GOD in the FATHER, and GOD with a Figure. He notes also (a) that CHRIST being GOD, it was not agreeable he should learn any thing. He pronounces (b) JESUS also to be the one only true, good, righteous SON of the FATHER after his Image and Similitude, the WORD of GOD. And in the same Chapter owns him to be (c) the GOD and Maker of all things. He says likewise, (d) that the SON of GOD does not go from place to place, but is always every where, and is contained no where, all Mind, all paternal Light, all Eye, seeth all things, heareth all things, knoweth all things, and by Power searcheth the Powers : Divine Characters.

(z) ΘΕΟΣ ἐν ἀνθρώπῳ σῆματι, ΛΟΓΟΣ ΘΕΟΣ ἐν τῷ ΠΑΤΡΙ, σὺν καὶ τῷ σῆματι ΘΕΟΣ. Pædag. li. i. cap. 2.

(a) Ἀλλὰ προσμαθεῖν μὲν αὐτὸν εἰκὸς ἔστι ἐν, ΘΕΟΝ ὄντα. Ib. cap. 6.

(b) εἶναι ἕνα μόνον ἀληθινόν, ἀγαθόν, δίκαιον, κατ' εἰκόνα καὶ ὁμοίωσιν τῷ ΠΑΤΡΙΟΣ ΤΙΟΝ ΙΗΣΟΥΝ, ἢ ΛΟΓΟΝ τῷ ΘΕΟΥ. Ib. cap. 11.

(c) ΘΕΟΣ καὶ δημιουργός.

(d) Οὐ μεταβαίνων ἐκ τόπου εἰς τόπον, πάντα δὲ ἀνπαντοτε, καὶ μεδαμῇ περιεχόμενος, ὅλος νῦν, ὅλος ὥς πατρώον, ὅλος ὁφθαλμός, πάντα ὁρᾶν, πάντα ἀκρῶν εἰδὼς πάντα, δύναμι τὰς δυνάμεις ἱερευῶν. Strom. li. 7.

The *Last* I cite shall be *Origen*, Disciple to the aforesaid *Clement*. Touching *CHRIST* he says thus ; (e) of whose *DIVINITY* there are so many Witnesses. And after that, (f) but if the Soul of *JESUS* be said to be united to the so great *SON* of *GOD*, by the highest Communion, never to be separated from him, it is no wonder. Where he plainly hints two Natures in *CHRIST*, the Great *SON* of *GOD*, and the Soul of *JESUS*. Nor does he only intimate this, but clearly and confidently teach and recommend it, insisting upon it as if he would inculcate it. For (as he goes on) Things that by Nature are two, according to what Scripture says, are well known to be one, and are so reputed. And then instances in Husband and Wife, who being joined together are one Flesh ; and in the Perfect Man, who being joined to the LORD is one Spirit. And from thence he infers ; (g) But if he that is joined to the LORD is one SPIRIT how much more the Soul of *JESUS* when joined to the LORD, to the *LOGOS* it

(e) Οὗ τ' ΘΕΟΤΗΤΟΣ μάρτυρες αἱ τοσαῦται. *Cont. Cell.* li. i.

(f) Εἰ δὲ τῷ τηλικύτῳ τῷ τῷ ΘΕΟΥ ἠνώδει φάσκοντες τῇ ἀφρα μετοχῇ ἐκείνῃ τὴν ΙΗΣΟΥ ψυχὴν, ἔκ τι χωρίζομένην ἀπ' ἐκείνῃ αὐτὴν ἐδένθαι φερόμενον. *Ib.* li. 6.

(g) Εἰ δὲ ὁ κολλώμενος τῷ ΚΤΡΙΩ ἔστι Πνεῦμα ἐστὶν, τίς μᾶλλον τ' ΙΗΣΟΥ ψυχῆς ἢ καὶν παρὰ πλῆθος κεκόλληται τῷ ΚΤΡΙΩ, τῷ Ἀυτολόγῳ, καὶ Ἀυτοσοφίᾳ, καὶ Ἀυτοαληθείᾳ, καὶ Ἀυτοδικαιοσύνῃ ; Ὅπως εἰ ἔτις ἔχει, ἔκ αὐτοῦ δύο ἢ ψυχὴ τῇ ΙΗΣΟΥ πρὸς τ' πάσῃ κτίσει ὡς προτέτακτο ΘΕΟΝ ΛΟΓΟΝ.

Self.

self, to Wisdom it self, to Truth it self, to Righteousness it self? And so the Soul of JESUS, and GOD the LOGOS the First-born of all the Creatures, are not two; as being made one by closest Union.

Then he sets down this deep Thought, or divine Notion well worthy of himself. *We say, from the authority of sacred Scripture, that to the Body of CHRIST which is the Church, the SON of GOD is a SOUL; but the Members of that whole Body are the Faithful. For as the Soul enlivens and moves the Body, which of it self has no living motion, so the LOGOS by a wonderful energy exciting his Body to things that ought to be done, moves every Member of the Church at once, doing nothing without reason.* And then he closes up the Point thus. *This therefore as I think, being not contemptible, what hinders that the Soul of JESUS, and JESUS in the whole by a most high and incomparable communion should be so join'd to the LOGOS it self; as not to be separated from the only Begotten and First-born of every Creature, nor to be another Different from him? So said this Man of infinite Learning, as Archbishop Tillotson terms him. Let the wise note it.*

To the Five Greek Fathers Testimonies, of CHRIST's DIVINITY, I take in the concurrent Evidence but of *Two Latin* ones, with all Brevity. They are *Tertullian*, and *S. Cyprian*. With their joint Suffrages they fairly

fairly come up to, and confirm the same High Article in their Writings, upon one and the same occasion or account. (*b*) GOD alone could teach how he would be pray'd to, says the *one*; commending the Prayer composed by our LORD. (*i*) *Let us pray as GOD our Master has taught us*, says the *other*. And so Both agree in confirming CHRIST's DEITY, and found their Arguments upon the same Instance.

But tho' CHRIST be *truly* GOD, yet because I advance not so far into the *Creed* as to take notice of it where that mentions it; let me here insert, that he is as *truly* Man too. And so this *Creed* in the sequel of it rightly informs us, where it says, that our LORD JESUS CHRIST, the SON of GOD, is GOD and Man. Perfect GOD, and Perfect Man. A Man as absolute, and compleat in all respects of Nature, as any SON of Adam. In proof of it, we need but consult and transiently consider what occurs in 1 *Thess.* 5. 23. Where Heaven gives us a kind of *Standard* by which to measure *Humanity*. For there it makes *ὅλον κληρον ἡμῶν*, the *whole of us*, or *entire Man*, to consist of SPIRIT, SOUL, and BODY. And was it not just so with our LORD? That he had a *Body* is cer.

(*b*) DEUS solus docere potuit, ut se vellet orari. *Textul.* lib. de Orat.

(*i*) Oremus—— sicut Magister DEUS docuit. S. Cyr. de Orat. Domin.

tain; else how could he be born, be betray'd, and seiz'd on as He was? and so basely and cruelly abus'd and crucify'd? And that He had *ψυχὴν*, an *Animal*, or *Sensitive Soul*; is as manifest from his *Motion*, *Hunger*, *Thirst*, *Weariness*, and the like. And then that he had *Πνεῦμα*, a *Rational*, *Immortal Spirit*; is as evident. I mean, from his last Words; *FATHER, into Thy Hands I commend my Spirit*. How notoriously weak therefore and shallow must they be, who phansy'd our LORD's Body was *animated* by the *DIVINITY*? Yet this was the Error of *Apollinarists*, and *Arians*, according to (k) *S. Austin*. And it lies cross to several Texts of Scripture. For then how could *his Soul be exceeding sorrowful unto death*, *S. Mar. 14. 34*? Or how could he *give up the GHOST*, *S. Mar. 15. 37*; when he had none? Or how could he have *committed his Spirit* to his *FATHER's* care, when had it been the *DIVINITY*, it could not have needed it?

Having thus shewed the *DEITY* of the *SON*, I am next to prove that of the *HOLY GHOST*; who in this *Article* is as positively affirmed to be *GOD*, as either of the other-

(k) *Apollinaristas Apollinaris instituit, qui de anima CHRISTI à Catholicis dissenserunt, dicentes, sicut Ariani, DEUM CHRISTUM carnem Suscepisse sine anima—— sed pro hac ipsum VERBUM in ea fuisse dixerunt. De Hæres.*

204 *An Antidote against Arianism.*

Divine PERSONS there mention'd. And that he really is so will appear these five ways.

From	{	His Names, or Titles.
		His Properties, or Attributes.
		The Worship paid to him.
		His Dispensing Supernatural Gifts.
		The Punishment of such as Sin against him.

First, *from his Names.* For He is called GOD. And if not directly and explicitly, yet by implication and necessary Consequence. And therefore when *Ananias* lyed to the HOLY GHOST, *S. Peter* told him very plainly, *thou hast not lyed unto Men, but unto GOD, Act. 5. 4.* Which, had not the HOLY GHOST been truly and naturally GOD, he could not have so pronounc'd Him.

And that he is certainly GGD, we have another good Proof in *1 Cor. 6. 19.* *Your Body is the Temple of the HOLY GHOST which is in you.* But were not the HOLY GHOST GOD, as He could have no *Right* to a Temple; so neither could his inhabitation in Christians convert them into *Temples* for himself. Yet his gracious Presence being attended with such a Consecrative Power, as can turn the Bodies of Good Men into sacred Temples; must He not be GOD?

Besides; (as was above noted) he is said to be the SPIRIT of GOD and *that* in Scripture is his common Appellative. And *the*
SPL

SPIRIT which is of GOD, 1 Cor. 2. 12. And the *SPIRIT* which proceedeth from the FATHER, S. John 15. 26. (k) Proceedeth out of him, as an *Emanation* or *Efflux* from himself: and for that very reason he must be *connatural* with Him, and so as truly GOD as the FATHER is. Which will be apparent,

Secondly, from his Properties. And having noted *Two* of them already, his *Eternity*, and *Almightiness*; I shall go upon but *Two* more, His *Omniscience*, and *Omnipresence*.

1st, his *Omniscience*. This is evident from 1 Cor. 2. 11. the *SPIRIT* searcheth all things, yea, the *Deep things* of GOD. And he that not only views all things without, but searches them within, and so pierces into them as to look entirely thro' them all; must needs be *Omniscient*. Especially when he penetrates into the *Deep things* of GOD, and understands them thoroughly. For his descrying (l) the *Profundities* of GOD; that is, his Counsels, Decrees, and most *Mysterious Secrets*: this shews his *Omniscience* to Perfection, and that Perfection demonstrates his *DEITY*. For no one but GOD can ever know the things of GOD. The Apostle owns and illustrates as much in the next verse. *What Man knoweth the things of a Man, save the Spirit of a Man which is in him?* Even so

(k) Ἐκπορεύεται.

(l) Τὰ ἕξῃ.

206 *An Antidote against Arianism.*

the things of GOD knoweth none but the SPIRIT of GOD. And truly what but an infinite SPIRIT who is GOD, could search and see thro' the infinite *Abysses* of GOD?

2ly, His *Omnipresence* is manifest from *1 Cor. 3. 16.* *Ye are the Temple of GOD, and the SPIRIT of GOD dwelleth in you.* And he whose Presence is so expansive as to dwell in all good Christians, it may as well be immense or boundless; and so spread thro' Infinite Space, which alone can contain an Infinite SPIRIT. And that Passage in the *139th Psalm, Whither shall I go from Thy SPIRIT?* implies as much.

Thirdly, That the HOLY GHOST is truly GOD, may be strongly argu'd, *from the Worship paid to him.* For divine Worship perform'd to any by heaven's Authority or Approbation, shews that Person to be *Divine.* Yet Holy Prayer an eminent piece of that Worship, was long since directed to the HOLY GHOST; and that by *S. Paul* himself a great Apostle inspir'd from above. Witness the concluding verse of his second Epistle to the *Corinthians: The Grace of our LORD JESUS CHRIST, and the Love of GOD, and the Communion of the HOLY GHOST be with you all. Amen.* Where it is remarkable to my purpose, that as the HOLY GHOST is rankt with the FATHER and the SON, and thereby made equal to both; so he is equally worshipp'd by being alike *invocated.* And then

then which shews their personal Distinction, they are devoutly apply'd to for three *Different Blessings*, as being so many distinct Donours, or Fountains of them, as it were. Tho' considering this solemn Petition of the Apostle's, it may be somewhat surprizing to think, that any learned Divines should question whether Prayers were ever made to the HOLY SPIRIT, in the *three first Centuries* after CHRIST. But if the Question goes upon *publick* Prayer to Him (as it does) then that omission was the more culpable, for this Warrant here given for this Duty, and its being thus exemplify'd by St. Paul. Tho' that He was betimes highly ador'd we learn from the *Nicene Creed*. *Who with the Father and the Son together is worshipped and glorify'd.*

And that he was worshipt by the Primitive Church is plainly witness'd by *Justin Martyr*. Who as he calls him (m) *The Divine SPIRIT*; so he declares in his (n) *Second Apology*; *The Prophetick Spirit we worship and adore, honouring him with reason and truth.* And how he was then honour'd and worshipt, we learn from *Polycarp*, who being bound to the Stake and ready to be burned for CHRIST, did piously thus express him-

(m) Θεὸν Πνεῦμα.

(n) Πνεῦμα τε τὸ Προφήτικον σεβόμεθα καὶ προσκυνῶμεν, λόγῳ καὶ ἀληθείᾳ τινῶν τῶν.

self. (o) *I will glorify thee, (O GOD) thro' the Eternal High Priest JESUS CHRIST thy beloved SON, thro' whom to thee, with him, and the HOLYGHOST, be Glory now and World without end.* Clemens of Alexandria also informs us of as much, where he earnestly exhorts, that we would (p) *Night and Day give thanks and praise; and that praising we would give Thanks.* But to whom? It follows, to the one *FATHER*, and to the *SON*, together with the *HOLYGHOST*. And what is *Thanksgiving* but a branch of *Prayer*? to which *Praise* is *Worship* equally Divine.

And to this practice of the *Primitive*, that of our excellent Church is agreeable. For besides that she prays to *GOD* so solemnly, and to every *PERSON* in the *GODHEAD* so distinctly, in the Beginning of her incomparable *Litany*: so how suitably does she praise and honour them in that admirable *Doxology*; *Glory be to the FATHER, and to the SON, and to the HOLYGHOST*; as it was in the *Beginning*, is now, and ever shall be, *World without end, Amen*: Which is so constantly, and frequently used in her daily Service? So that in our publick Service we

(o) Σε δοξάζω δια τῆ αἰωνίου Ἀρχιερέως ἸΗΣΟΥ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ τῷ ἀγαπητῷ σὺ Παίδι· δι' ὃ σὺν Ἀυτῷ, καὶ ΠΝΕΥΜΑΤΙ ΑΓΙΩ ΔΟΞΑ, καὶ νῦν, καὶ εἰς τὰς μέλλοντας αἰῶνας. Ἀμήν. Euseb. li. 4. cap. 15.

(p) Νύκτωρ μετ' ἡμέραν—εὐχαρισῦντας αἰνεῖν, αἰνεῖτας εὐχαρισεῖν, τῷ μόνῳ ΠΑΤΡΙ, καὶ ΥΙΩ, σὺν τῷ ΑΓΙΩ ΠΝΕΥΜΑΤΙ. Padiog. li. 3. Sub. Fin.

μετ' ὧς δοξα τῷ θεῷ, καὶ πατρὶ, καὶ τῷ ἁγίῳ πνεύματι
epist. frat. Symonacorum

δοξαζετε κυρίῳ ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ δι' ὃ καὶ σὺν τῷ
δοξα καὶ Δυνάμει σὺν τῷ πνεύματι ἁγίῳ. καὶ ἀμήν.
come, syngali in actis cum martyri 1. bro 8. c. 1.
12 20 21 22

come

(q) K

come not short of the ancient Christians. For as they had (according to *Justin Martyr*) (q) *common Prayers*, so have we an unparallel'd *Volume*, or compleat System of common Devotions. O that they were but as laudably us'd, as they are wisely and piously compos'd. But here is our great and never enough to be lamented fault; that we do not *duly frequent* the Divine Service, and join in it with meet reverence and zeal. What, have we forgot the time when it was violently snatcht from us; and not only the *publick* but *private* use of it was forbidden under *Penalties*? Or if we remember those Sacrilegious Times, are we so in love with them as to wish their Return and open a way for it? Yet when we despise our *peerless Liturgy* by careless neglecting to join in it; what do we less than provoke GOD to renew that sad Calamity? and how justly and speedily may he do it?

Fourthly, The DEITY of the HOLY GHOST may be evinc'd, *from his Dispensing Supernatural GIFTS to Men*. An Account of this Dispensation, and a Catalogue of those Glorious Gifts, we have in 1 Cor. 12. But of all the wonderfull Gifts, there mention'd, which indeed demonstrate the SPIRIT's DIVINITY; for brevity's sake I insist but on Two.

He empower'd Men to work Miracles.

And he inabl'd them to Prophecy.

(q) Κόιναις Ἐυχαίς.

1st, *He impower'd them to work Miracles.* We are well assur'd from Heaven, that persons of ordinary rank, and mean Capacity did Wonders. Even sorry Fisher-men on a sudden, and without the least previous Teaching; could speak in Tongues which they never heard, and interpret Languages which they never learnt. Such Languages as those of choicest Parts could not soon be Masters of, tho' they had best helps and advantages for it, and studied them with diligence and application. The like, or same Persons also by a quick and unsought Sagacity, could at first view discover the Spirits or Dispositions of People. They could see whether their *Tempers* or *Principles* were good, and know how they stood inclin'd perhaps better than themselves. They could likewise cure the Blind, heal the Sick, raise the Dead, and cast out Devils. And all this they could do by easiest means, and as I may say, by slight methods. As by Words of their Mouths, *Touches* of their Hands, or by *Kerchiefs*, or *Aprons* sent to the Diseased or Possessed. Or (which is less in the *Art* and wondrous in the *Efficacy*) by their *passant Shadows* glancing upon them as they walked by.

Now when such surprizing Works were done by Men outwardly contemptible, and Agents so weak and seemingly incompetent, whence can we derive their miraculous Act

or the Force by which they did them, but from pure *Omnipotence*? But then their Thaumaturgick power being all from the influence of the HOLY GHOST how surely must *He* be *Almighty*, and so truly GOD?

As to the Miracles noted, and many others, 'tis certain they were done not only frequently but very *publickly* in the presence of numerous Spectators. And as sure it is, that between the external visible *Causes* noted, and those mighty *Effects*; there was neither due Connexion, nor just Proportion. For how could a bare *Word*, or light *Con-*
cept; a gliding *Shadow*, or a piece of *Linen* transmitted from one to another; restore the Blind, recover the Sick, revive the Dead, or drive wicked Spirits out of poor *Demoniacks*? There is no suitable fitness or proper Analogy between the extrinseck *Agents*, and *Operations*, to make the one effective of the other. Grant we must therefore that they were wrought by an higher Power than any that were seen concerned in them. And whose could that be but the HOLY SPIRIT's, who is the recorded *chief efficient* of them?

To invalidate this Argument, should any *question whether there ever were such Miracles*: that would impeach the Truth of Sacred History, and render the Objectors too disingenuous. I mean, in that they justly credit *Joseph, Tacitus, Suetonius*, and the like *Histo-*

212 *An Antidote against Arianism.*

rians (tho' less eminent;) and should they not do it, would be ready to count their not believing them, a piece of groundless and *wretched Scepticism*: and at the same time doubt of the infallible Truths deliver'd in the *Gospel*, and of the momentous Accounts there register'd. Yet let them but believe the *New Testament*, as they do the reports of *Civil Historiographers*; and they must own the Miracles to be actually done which are there related. Tho' for not believing them they must be guilty of unreasonable *Suspension of Faith*, or which is worse, of vile and dangerous *Incredulity*. Whereas would they as firmly believe the Sacred Writings, as they do those of *Prophane Authors* mention'd, the issue in likelihood might be *this*. Their Faith would then with GOD's Blessing so influence their Minds, and govern their Lives as to make them *Pious* here, and *Blessed* for ever. And what good account can be given why rational Creatures should be backward to assent, to what's most conducive to their endless Bliss?

Should any again in way of Cavil or Subterfuge, ascribe these Miracles to *Nature*, and suppose them done by a secret unknown force of hers: with them I might justly expostulate thus. *Why then are not like Miracles done now as were formerly?* And why are they not wrought with as much ease and frequency as they were by CHRIST's Apo-

stles?

ties? *Mens* personal Abilities seem equal to theirs; and as to *Nature*, she continues what she was in that Age. She's in the same *State*, of the same *Strength*, and as able to do Miracles *now*, or assist in working them, as ever she was *then*. The *Earth* retains the same Constitution, the *Air* the same Temperature, the *Heavens* the same Influence, that they had in CHRIST's Time. Again therefore I demand, why are not Miracles as common *now* as ever? Did *Nature* work them, so they *would* and *must* be: for all second Causes are extant *now* that were *then*, and every whit as operative that way. Yet now with us Miracles are ceased, we neither see, nor hear of any. This makes it evident that they were not Effects of *Nature*; but as Scripture gives us to understand, were wrought by the Power of the HOLY GHOST. And then the true reason of their *Cessation* is this. GOD suspends the Gift of working them amongst us, because we *need them not*. And it is not fit that *Omnipotence* should be exerted in *superfluous* Acts.

When the holy Gospel was first promulgated, they that publisht it wanted Miracles as meet *Credentials* to recommend it: but the Doctrines of CHRIST being now *received*, and withal recorded in the Holy Books, together with *the Miracles* which confirm'd them; we need no other Seals or Testimonials to authenticate and establish them.

214 *An Antidote against Arianism.*

But here then I must drop this melancholy Note. How deplorable and amazing is it, that profess'd Christians should believe and value Treatises of *Heathens* of little moment, and some of them perhaps of dubious Credit; and at the same time despise and oppose *divine Truths* of highest importance! Truths deliver'd by the SON of GOD, or his inspir'd Emissaries; and also attested with *Miracles* wrought by the HOLY SPIRIT; and design'd to make them virtuous and happy.

2ly, The HOLY GHOST *inabled Men to Prophecy*. To foretell *future Events* long before they happen'd, and that in Cases and Matters of purest Contingency. Yet they have fully answer'd their various Predictions in the minutest circumstances of exact completion. And must not the HOLY GHOST be GOD then, whose knowledge is so vast as to see things to *come* as if they were *present*?

The *Power of Prophecy* springs up from unerring *Præscience*, as that does from infinite *Intelligence*; and so it can be in none but GOD. And therefore it is observable, that GOD challenges *False DEITIES* at this to prove themselves *True*, *Isai. 41. 23. Shew the things that are to come hereafter, that we may know that ye are GODS.* Intimating that Prerogative is his *peculiar*; so inherent in, and proper to *Himself*, as not to be communicable

nicable to *any other*. Could any Beings rightly claim *th's Privilege* as theirs, they must be GODS, as fully answering or coming up to the DIVINE TEST above laid down. Natural Præscience therefore of Future Contingencies being most plainly in the HOLY GHOST (as appears by his dispensing the Gift of Prophecy) he must be GOD; that being according to divine Determination *good authentick Proof* of a DEITY, or a certain *infallible Note* of it. And therefore in the *Nicene Creed* we are taught to believe that it was *We who spake by the Prophets*.

And truly punctual predicting contingent Futurities, may so far be a *surer Proof* of a DEITY, than *Miracles*; as it is a *more satisfactory one*. For Scripture tells us of *Lying Wonders*, 2 *Thes.* 2. 9. And *false Wonders* may prompt us to *suspect* those that are *true*, and bring them into Question and Contempt. So *Moses's* genuine Miracles were clouded or eclips'd by the counterfeit ones of *Egyptian Sorcerers*. But in perspicuous or explicit *Prophecy*, there's no room for Imposture or Collusion. And therefore it is said, *Apoc.* 19. 10. that *the Testimony of JESUS is the SPIRIT of Prophecy*. One of the chiefest Arguments, and brightest Evidences we have, for CHRIST's being the SON of GOD, and the true *Messiah*; was the *Power of Prophecy*, which by the SPIRIT he gave to his Profelytes.

216 *An Antidote against Arianism.*

And well may it be allow'd to exceed *other Miracles* in force of Testimony. For besides that 'tis so choice a Miracle *it self*, it carries with it openest Proof of its being so; as it is freer from *grounds* or occasions of *Capit* than *other Miracles*. Thus, when by a *Word*, or a *Touch*, the Sick, or the Dying, the Lame, or the Dumb; the Blind, or the Deaf were cured: the Body of Man being so dark and impenetrable, that no Eye can see into it to discern its Habit or Constitution; it might be pretended in case of *such Cures* that the Parties affected had then a secret disposition in them to do well of themselves at that very Juncture; but this being *unperceiv'd* by all about them, tho' they recover'd *naturally* of their respective Maladies; thro' *mistake* it might be thought they were heal'd *miraculously*. And thus what's done by *divine Influence*, by the humorous may be imputed to *Nature's Efficiency*. But *Prophecy* is so plain and barefac'd a Miracle, as not to be thus eluded or turn'd off. For that having relation to future time, and distant things; when it is fairly accomplisht it is fully justifi'd. So justifi'd that there will be no clapping false Imputations upon it. For then it shines out with such glorious Brightness as shews it to be truly wonderful; and strikes the Mind with such strong Convictions, as leave no room to doubt of its *Miraculousness*.

hA

Non

Nor does it at all weaken this Argument that *the Devil* pretends to *power of Prediction*. For whatever he has deliver'd of that Nature, even by his very *Oracles*; was always so obscure or ambiguous; as to be only *conjectural*, or *fallacious*; and so far from *Prophetick*. Infomuch that when *they* were consulted as to future Events, the Answers return'd were dark and cloudy, wrapt up in doubtfulness and much incertainty, as cover'd with the Evasion of a *double Sense*. A sly Contrivance, but rarely fitted to *Satan's* purpose. For then the issue happening *either way*, it must fall in with the one, or other of the *Two*, as being equally futed to *both* the Meanings. And by this Artifice as he sav'd himself from the Scandal of *Lying*; so he seem'd to be capable of *foretelling the Truth*. And by this trick as he subtilly screen'd himself from shameful Censure; so he made a shift to keep up his Credit amongst his Devotoes, and effectually serv'd the chief End he aim'd at.

Instances of this are notorious in History; I name but Three. The First shall be that Answer to the King of *Epirus*, full of Craft and cunning Delusion.

(r) *I say that you Æacides the Romans shall overcome.* But instead of *Pyrrhus's* overcoming the *Romans*, as he understood it;

(r) Aiq te Æacida Romanos vincere posse.

They

218 *An Antidote against Arianism.*

They conquer'd him. The Words were so adapted to both, as to fall in with either's Success.

And that to another Prince.

(s) *Thou shalt go shalt return never shalt perish by war.* Who taking the Words as kindly meant to himself, found to his cost that he misinterpreted, and misappli'd them. Yet into such a Form were they cast, that had the Event prov'd quite contrary, it would have hit it as exactly.

And lastly, that to the *Græcian* Monarch.

(t) *Cræsus passing Halys shall destroy abundance of Wealth.* But having got his Army over the River, he soon perceiv'd that he greatly mistook the meaning of the verse; and that his *own* not the *Persian Wealth* was to be wasted. Tho' it was so artificially worded, that had the like Misfortune befallen *Cyrus* it would have pointed as directly at *That*.

From these *χρησμεια*, or *Oracular Responses*, (cited to prove the Truth I assert) this much appears. That when the Prince of Darkness most solemnly foretold things to come; his Predictions were answerable to his Character: *Dark*, that is, thro' ambiguity; and so full of Deceit and Equivocative Guile, as to have nothing of certain mean-

(s) *Ibis redibis nunquam per bella peribis.*

(t) *Cræsus Halyn penetrans, magnam pervertet opum* Vim.

ing in them. And therefore they who sought for Knowledge from them, and depended most upon their Direction; were commonly disappointed. For when they took what was told them to be very true, and thought they might safely proceed upon it as to happy Issues: they found that by false Guides they were wretchedly misled: And so their Undertakings which they took to be hopefull, prov'd fatal to their *Persons*, or else to their *Projects*, if not to *both*.

But true Prophecy did never thus impose upon Men. That always meant whatever it said. It disappoints *none*, nor does it deceive *any*; but in all that it speaks is absolutely free from Failure and Fallacy. And therefore in that *Being* where it dwells, and from whence it flows as from its proper *Source*; it must needs be a Mark or Character of its DIVINITY. For Ability to Prophecie, and to capacitate *others* to do it; implies fore-knowledge not only of what *is not* at present; but also of what *shall be*; tho' we think it *may* or may *not* come to pass: the true Case (as to *us*) of things *contingent*. And to foresee this, and predict it unerringly; supposes a thorow penetration into the closest and most occult Secrets that *can* be, tho' never so *remote*.

As (to speak plainly) into all the Causes of things, and the most latent Seeds, or Potentialities of those Causes. As likewise into
to

to their natural Force, and accidental Energy; and the particular Connexions and Dependencies which those have amongst themselves, and whereby they influence one another. And moreover into all the hidden Windings, and possible Turnings, which in a long and variable Process any one or more of them might run into; and by which Excursions (tho' never so few, and never so little) the Chain of Causes might be interrupted and carried off from the foretold Effects.

Now when so vast and piercing a knowledge as must run thro' such a Train of distant and contingent Intricacies, is needful to *Prophecy*, in *that Being* which is the Fountain of it: This proves that Being wherein the Power of Prophecy originally dwells, to be of *Divine Capacity*, and boundless Comprehension: that is, to be GOD. And consequently as sure as we are that *that Power* has been in the World, and that by the HOLY GHOST it was imparted to poor Mortals; so sure we may be, that the HOLY GHOST is a DIVINE PERSON in the GOD HEAD; because he could communicate that so Divine and Glorious a Gift. And let none wonder that *Justin Martyr* (to name no more of the Primitive Writers) should stile him *so often* the *Prophetick SPIRIT*. For Prophecy being a Power so High and Venerable, and HE the Centre and Source of it;

it; the *Epithet* was an honourable Insinuation of his DEITY.

Lastly, That the HOLY GHOST is GOD, the Punishment of such as sin against Him, does well assure us. It is very high, and extremely severe, according to our LORD's account of it, S. Mat. 12. 31. *I say unto you, that all manner of Sin and Blasphemy shall be forgiven unto Men, but the Blasphemy against the HOLY GHOST shall not be forgiven unto Men.* Now if the Sin against the HOLY GHOST (which is imputing the Miracles he wrought by his *own* immediate Power to the Devil's operation;) be as hard, and harder to be forgiven, than all other Sin against GOD and CHRIST: this evidently proves him to be of no lower Nature than They. For the guilt of Sin, and so the punishment of that Guilt, rises in proportion to the Dignity of that Person against whom it is committed. And then where the highest Punishment in the World (by Him that shall be the *Eternal Judge* of it) is openly declar'd to be due to all that dare to sin against *this Person*; we may well conclude that in the World there's none higher than he. And thus no less than the SON of GOD proves the HOLY GHOST to be Equal to the FATHER, and Himself, and as truly GOD as either of them. Tho' that They are all Divine and Distinct PERSONS too, is as manifest from Scripture; and that touching the HOLY GHOST, as well as the
FA-

222 *An Antidote against Arianism.*

FATHER and the SON. For as in the 16th of *S. John* at the 13th v. he is said to be the *SPIRIT of Truth* (for good reasons, particularly as he was to lead Christians into all Truth:) so in the 14th v. our LORD says of Him, *He shall take of mine, and shall shew it unto you.* Now he that is the *SPIRIT of Truth*, and can receive the Truth of GOD deliver'd to him by *CHRIST*; and can shew and communicate it to his Profelytes: He is plainly discover'd to be a *PERSON*, or a Living understanding Agent, by his vital rational Acts, and the Power he has to do them.

And now to finish this Article (as 'tis high time) Tho' *the FATHER is GOD* (as it says) and *the SON is GOD*, and *the HOLY GHOST is GOD*: yet to prevent all suspicion of *Tritheism*, and to shut that Phanfy out of Christians Minds; they are so far from being own'd for *Three GODS* here, that they are affirm'd to be but *One* expressly, and very truly: for so said *CHRIST*, *there is one GOD, and there is none other but he.* *S. Mar.* 12. 32. And *S. Paul* asserts the same thing; *1 Tim.* 2. 5. *for there is one GOD.* Testimonies sufficient to confirm that Truth. And that the same was receiv'd amongst the Ancients, *Tertullian* witnesseth. For writing against *Praxeas* he has this Expression. (u) Which

(u) Qui tres unum sunt, non unus; quomodo dictum est, Ego & PATER unum sumus; ad Substantiæ Unitatem, non ad numeri Singularitatem:

Three
as it
to U
Run
same
while
of Su
One,
An
tain
that
prov
ny P
let m
is mo
Two
they
wher
a Sup
Contr
If th
must
and f
Equa
on or
and I
flame
And
petua

(w)
Substan

Three are One [thing] not one [PERSON:] as it is said, I and my FATHER are One; as to Unity of Essence, not as to Singularity of Number. And in another place of the same Tract; (w) so also One may be All, while All are of One, that is to say, by Unity of Substance, and so far the Three LIVES are One, as they are in one Essence.

And that there is *but One GOD*, is as certain from Scripture, as 'tis clear from thence that there *is One*. And tho' to go about to prove that, might seem impertinent, so many Proofs of it being very obvious: yet this let me add, *That the Unity of the GODHEAD is most clear from Reason*. For were there Two GODS, they must either be *alike*, or they must be *different*. If *alike*, why *Two*? when one of them must be *superfluous*. And a *Superfluous GOD* must be one of the rankest *Contradictions*, or *Impossibilities* imaginable. If they be *different* in their *Natures*, they must be the same in their *Wills*, and *Tempers*; and so in their *Interests*. And then *both* being Equal as to *Power in themselves*, and *Dominion over the Creatures*; their proper *Enmities* and *Discords* would soon *affect*, that is, inflame and divide their *Subjects* of all sorts: And then they and their *Parties* being perpetually up; and exceeding outrageous a-

(w) Sic quoq; unus fit omnia, dum ex uno omnia, per Substantiz scilicet unitatem.

224 *An Antidote against Arianism.*

gainst one another ; by furious Strifes they would fill the World with endless Confusions. Conclude therefore we may that there is but *One GOD*, according to the tenour of this *Article* ; and that there *can* be no more.

And here *Plato* falls in fairly with us Christians. And as he is said, by his just (x) Admirers, to affirm there are *Three Supertemporals and Eternals* ; the *GOOD*, the *MIND*, and the *SOUL* of the *Universe* ; yet still as there is but *One GOD*, so according to *Jamlichus's* Phrase, He is ἀκίνητος, *immoveable*, ἐν μονότητι ἃ ἐαυτῷ ἐστίν, μένων : *continuing in the Solitariness of his own Unity*. Tho' as the cited Father declares, the *Platonick* *GOOD*, *MIND*, and *SC. L* ; with us, are the *FATHER*, *SON*, and *HOLY GHOST*.

And as *Justin Martyr* perswaded the (y) *Greeks* to read the Prophecies of Holy Men from which they might learn, ἕνα καὶ μόνον εἶναι ΘΕΟΝ : *that there is but one GOD only* ; which he calls ὁ πρῶτον γνώρισμα, *the first Document of true Piety* : so he advis'd them to obey *Orphens* and others, *who wrote the same things*, περὶ ἑνὸς ΘΕΟΥ, *touching one single GOD*.

(x) Τρία ὑπέρχοντα καὶ αἰδία τ' ἀγαθόν, καὶ νῦν, καὶ τὸ παντὸς τῆς ψυχῆς. Vid. Theodoret. lib. de Princip.

(y) Cohortat.

ARTICLE XII.

So likewise the FATHER is LORD, the SON LORD, and the HOLY GHOST LORD.

And yet they are not Three LORDS, but One LORD.

EXPOSITION.

This Article differs very little from the former, only in the variation of one *Title* ; GOD *there*, being *here* turned into LORD. Theless therefore may serve in way of Paraphrase upon it.

The ever Blessed DEITY in the Sacred Writings is often stiled *the LORD GOD*, and *the LORD our GOD*, and the like. And that the Composer of this Creed might not seem to lessen any PERSON in the TRIAD ; but rather to honour them in fullest Measures by all the *great Titles* given to them, setting forth their Sovereign Dominion : he here calls every one of them LORD. But then that none might mistake them for *Three Different LORDS*, he puts them past that extravagant Notion, by asserting positively they are but *One LORD*. Meaning They were but *One LORD* in Essence ; tho' *Three* in PERSONS. And so this Article may go perhaps
Q for

for a fuller Proof, or somewhat more emphatical a Confirmation of the TRINITY. But here I shall only add, that such of the Learned as shall think fit to peruse *Plato's Timæus*, his *Second Epistle to Dionysius*; his *Sixth to Hermias*, *Erastus*, and *Coriscus*, &c. In the Opinion of the very Learned, they may there find the Doctrine of the Christian TRINITY fairly pointed at. Not that the Divine Philosopher had that Knowledge by Inspiration neither. So far was he from that, that *Theodoret* affirms (and with all probability) *in his Second Epistle to Dionysius*, *he sought it from the Hebrews Philosophy and Divinity.*

And that I mention *Plato's* asserting a TRINITY more than once; let none wonder at it. It is but to notify, that the best and most eminent of *Pagan Philosophers*, could not but so admire that Glorious Article of our Religion, as to embrace it Himself, and teach it to others: while Numbers of CHRISTIANS (and many of them Learned) shamefully despise, reject, and oppose it; tho' to them in great Favour GOD more clearly reveal'd, and most kindly recommended it. Open, open their Eyes, O most compassionate JESUS our GOD, that so they may see and acknowledge Thee to be at last, what Thou really art, and also the Two other adorable and infinite PERSONS.

But
LOA
two
CHR
the I
6:4
S. M
Th
LOR
or of
Texts
is call
meant
adver

For
the C
every
GOD
So
lick R
GOD

As if
y Divi
and dec

But that the Two Titles, **GOD**, and **LORD**, are *Equivalent*; we learn from two incomparable Teachers, *Moses*, and **CHRIST**. For as *Moses* says, *Hear, O Israel, the LORD our GOD is one LORD*, *Deut. 6:4*: so **CHRIST** speaking of the True **GOD**, *S. Mat. 12:29*, does the same.

The use I make of the Article is but this. **LORD**, and **GOD**, being Titles equivocal, or of the same signification; from many Texts in the *New Testament* where **CHRIST** is called **LORD**; we may safely infer he is meant to be **GOD**. And so intelligent and advertent Readers may observe.

ARTICLE XIII.

For like as we are compelled by the Christian Verity to acknowledge every **PERSON** by Himself to be **GOD** and **LORD**:

So are we forbidden by the Catholic Religion, to say there be Three **GODS**, or Three **LORDS**.

EXPOSITION.

As if he had said; Tho' I pronounce every Divine **PERSON** to be **GOD** and **LORD**; and declare withal that they are not *Three*

Q 2 **GODS**,

228 *An Antidote against Arianism.*

GODS, or *Three LORDS*: yet I do not this of my own Judgment. For what I say as to Both Points, the Personal DIVINITY, and Essential UNITY, of the HOLY THREE; is not only founded upon Christian Verity, or the *Evangelick* Doctrine taught by CHRIST; but moreover is built upon the Catholick Religion and confirm'd by *that*; particularly by the *Nicene Creed* containing the Substance of it. In which Creed all true Catholicks profess first, *We believe in one GOD.* (x) And it goes on recommending the Three PERSONS in the GODHEAD by name, as worthy Objects of our Faith. That is to say, *the FATHER Almighty maker of Heaven and Earth. The one LORD JESUS CHRIST the only begotten SON of GOD. And the HOLY GHOST, &c.* And the Three PERSONS there being thus signifi'd to be *One GOD*; the *Catholick Religion* does as much prohibit our owning Three GODS, and Three LORDS; as *the Christian Verity* constrains us to acknowledge each PERSON to be GOD and LORD.

(x) Πιστεύομεν εἰς ἕνα ΘΕΟΝ, where the Greek Copy has Comma, *tho' the English has none*; for want of which some might be the more ready captiously to infer, that the FATHER alone is the One GOD there meant.

ARTICLE XIV.

The FATHER is made of none, neither Created, nor Begotten.

EXPOSITION.

And how could the FATHER possibly be Made, be Created, or Begotten of any ; when He Himself was before All ? And therefore he challenges the *Primity* of Being as his *peculiar* Right and Privilege more than once ; I AM THE FIRST. Nay, he it was that made all things before they were, and to them præexisted *eternally* ; else He Himself could never have been. See *Exposit.* of *Artic.* 6.

ARTICLE XV.

The SON is of the FATHER alone, not Made, nor Created, but Begotten.

EXPOSITION.

Tho' the FATHER, the *first* LIFE, or PERSON in the GODHEAD, naturally exists *of* and *from* Himself, and ever did so :

Q 3

Yet

230 *An Antidote against Arianism.*

Yet the SON, the *Second PERSON* or *LIFE*, had his Subsistence from the *FATHER* solely. But then as he did not *Create* Him out of nothing, so neither did he make him out of any thing extant. This was rightly and wisely remarkt by *Athenagoras*, who affirms the SON to be the natural (y) *first-born Offspring of the FATHER*, but *not as made*. Nor indeed could he be *Made*. For I ask; can *GOD* make one *Creature* to be another at the same time? Can he make a *Mite* to be an *Elephant*? or a *Flea* to be a *Lion*? A *Beast* to be a *Fowl*? or a *Fowl* to be a *Fish*? How much less then could he make a *Creature* to be *GOD* in the same respect? Which yet he must have done had he made his SON. For then tho' he was naturally *GOD* (as has been prov'd) he must have been a *Creature* too, as he was *made*; tho' he was truly *GOD* as begotten by the *FATHER*. But I speak of the SON *singly*, not of *CHRIST* a complex Being.

But here then the Great Question will be, *HOW* was he begotten? I answer directly, in *way of Divine Propagation*. For the Blessed *THREE* being *LIFES*, as Scripture informs us, why should not *Two* of Them rise so? One thing consider'd (which I have (z) elsewhere suggested) nothing can be more Pro-

(y) ὁ γόντος γεννημα ἐκ τῆς τοῦ ΠΑΤΡΙΟΣ ὥς γεννηματι.
Leg. pro Christianis.

(z) See Essay upon the *HOLY TRINITY*. Part 2.

bable
see (C
Prop
like b
ly it
self,
And
shian
Philo
did P
exov
that S
begat
But th
bove
Sho
was H
from
FATH
where
beginn
not m
self;
SON.
duc d
becaus
a very
plainl
Produ

(a) A
(b) B

bable

bable, or rather more Certain. For when we see (as all do) *Common Life* so generally *Propagated* upon Earth; why should not the like be done by Infinite Life in Heaven? Only it must be done in a way agreeable to it self, that is, most infinitely GLORIOUS. And that this SON was *begotten*, what Christian should ever doubt, when an *Ethnick* Philosopher believ'd and taught it? Yet so did *Plato*. For he speaks of τὸν τῷ Ἀγαθῷ ἕγονον, ὃν Ἐὐαθὸν ἐγένετο ἀνάλαντον ἑαυτῷ. *that SON of THE GOOD, whom THE GOOD begat resembling Himself.* De Repub. li. 6. But then generated he was in a way far above what we can utter or conceive.

Should it be enquir'd farther, *WHEN was He Begotten?* I must answer positively, *from Eternity.* And therefore the learned FATHER and Philosopher speaks truly, where he says *he was* (a) *Begotten without beginning.* For the Adorable FATHER does not more naturally and necessarily *exist* Himself; than he does from Eternity *beget* His SON. And truly were he begotten and produced *in time* he could never be really GOD, because he could not be so *naturally.* I find a very great Man was of my Mind; for he plainly asserts; (b) *That Nature which is producible is not Divine.*

(a) Ἀνάχως γενομένῳ. Clem. Alexandr. Strom. li. 7.

(b) Bishop Pearson on the Creed.

232 *An Antidote against Arianism.*

Besides; were the Glorious SON begotten in time, before his Generation he must have been *GOD contingent*. A goodly Title for Him to bear before-hand; and as fine a Circumstance of congruity to him. For then he might *be*, or *not be*, as the Original LIFE in the GODHEAD pleased. And being to become GOD at his *Will*, it was at his *Choice* whether he should *ever* be so, as it was in his *Power* never to *beget* him. And thus if his Being was not *Casual*, it was certainly *arbitrary* and precarious. And are not these pretty Notions to fix upon Him who is *truly* GOD?

But *another Question* may here be put. If the SON be GOD at such a rate, *HOW* can he be *Worshipp'd*? For GOD from Heaven expressly reproves such as *did Service to them which by Nature are no GODS*, Gal. 4. 8. By which we learn, that if the SON of GOD, be not GOD *naturally*, he can be no meet Object of *Religious Adoration*. The Eternal GOD, indeed being so *by Nature*, has just and clear Right to our Service, and we pay him it upon that account. And as to *Him* we pay it for that good reason; so we can do it to *none* of a lower Nature, or meaner Quality than Himself, without being *Idolatrours*. And therefore it is remarkable, that S. Paul's Charge against Idolaters, Rom. 1. 25. was, that *they served and worshipped the Creature, rather than the Creator Blessed* for

for ever. Amen. So that for certain, Divine Worship must be given to none but *the Creator Blessed for ever.* And therefore had the SON been begotten in time, according to that Text we could not *worship Him* because he was not from *Eternity*, and so could not be *the Creator ever Blessed.* For his not being so would degrade him below the ever Blessed GOD, and that degradation would render him unadorable. Should any alledge, that need not be ; for the SON might have *the same Nature* with the FATHER tho' begotten in time ; and indeed if *begotten by Him* could have *no other* : I reply. The SON could by no means be Begotten *in time* for *Three Reasons.*

1st, Because then *the DEITY must have been Changeable, and that in the very Constitution of it.* Immutability was ever reckon'd one of GOD's Properties, and so it must be. So far is he from actual Mutation, that he is not obnoxious to any thing like it ; nor is it possible that he ever should. For his Essence being infinite is capable neither of *Addition* nor *Subtraction* : and where is no Augmentation or Diminution in any respect ; there can be no *Alteration* neither. A just Account of GOD's Unchangeableness. *He rests upon the Basis of his own PERFECTION, which being most absolute, is invariable.* Fixt and steady, and more immoveable than the Foundations of the Earth, or the Pillars of Heaven,

234 *An Antidote against Arianism.*

Heaven, or the eternal Law of Nature it self. GOD signifies as much, (c) *I am the LORD, I change not.* And what was said of CHRIST, is as true of GOD, (d) *the same Yesterday, to day, and for ever.* He ever was what he is, and so he ever will be. But then how impossible was it that the SON of GOD should be *Begotten in time*, when his coming so into Being would not only have contradicted GOD's veracious Word, by a most extraordinary *Change* in HIM; but would likewise have been inconsistent with the *immutable DEITY*?

2ly, The SON could not be *Begotten in time*, because then *till that time the DEITY must have been Imperfect.* The GODHEAD, all know, is *infinitely Perfect*, and always was so: nor could it be otherwise, infinite Perfection being *essential* to it. But then how could a *new PERSON*, a *natural SON* be *begotten in time* in the DEITY, when that being *infinitely Perfect*, and consequently *eternally so*; nothing *in time* could be *added* to it? And if *nothing*, then how much less a *Natural SON*, who (we must remember) was from Eternity necessary, even to constitute the DEITY a Glorious TRINITY? And yet (we must consider too) *that* could not be done till he was *Begotten*. And therefore till he was *Begotten*, and so that Vacui-

(c) Malach. 3. 6. (d) Heb. 13. 8.

ty in the GODHEAD was filled up by his Accession or Union to it; It must needs have been *imperfect*; and as for a TRINITY, till ~~then~~ none could have been. No, nor then neither, as has been said, without making an unspeakable Change in the DEITY, whose essential Property it is to be immutable, as was now said.

3ly, The SON could not be *Begotten in time*, because then *He* (who has been here proved GOD) *must have been Imperfect too*. For how could he be *Perfect* as GOD who is not *Eternal*? And how could he be *Eternal* who was *begotten in time*? Were it so therefore with the SON, I might say of Him as *Tertullian* did of the Goodness of *Marcion's* GOD, (e) That as *sometime it was not, so after a while it may not be*. So he that was not eternal *one way*, may not be so *the other*. The Person made at Will, at best can have but a dependent Being; and as he exists by his Maker's Power, so he may be annihilated at his Pleasure; which the SON cannot be. For His Generation was natural, and so necessary, and consequently he must be completely *Eternal* because his FATHER is so. Nor is the FATHER Himself *Eternal* only, but all Excellencies in him (his *Attributes* for instance) are as *Eternal* too. And can

(e) Potest & non esse quandoq; sicut non fuit aliquando.
Cont. *Marcion*. li. i. cap. 22.

236 *An Antidote against Arianism.*

his own and only Begotten SON, so far above *them* in *Nature* and *Dignity*, be *inferior* to them in *Duration*? Who can admit of so dull and heavy an incongruity? They that *can*, may seem to *Ethnicize*, or lean towards the Heathen in this Case. For *their* wild and gross Perswasion it was, that there were Superi, and Inferi; *Higher*, and *Lower GODS*; and that some of them did *beget* others.

ARTICLE XVI.

The HOLY GHOST is of the FATHER and of the SON, neither Made, nor Created, nor Begotten, but Proceeding.

EXPOSITION.

This Creed having shewed how the SON subsists, it here goes on to account for the *Rise* of the HOLY GHOST. And in short it avers it to be not by *Formation*, *Creation*, or *Generation*; but by *Procession*. And most rightly. For in S. *Joh.* 15. 26. He is declar'd to *proceed from the FATHER*. Yet not from Him alone, nor does it appear that he could do so, but rather the contrary. For He is said to be *the (e) SPIRIT of*

(e) Rom. 8. 9.

CHRIST;

CHRIST; (f) *the SPIRIT of the SON*; and (g) *the SPIRIT of JESUS*; as expressly as he is said to be *the SPIRIT of the FATHER*. And why, but because he *proceeds equally from both*, as this Article affirms? and so as much from the one, as from the other.

And for it there is good *Reason*, and indeed *Necessity*. Because otherwise instead of intimate *Union* of the PERSONS in the TRIAD; there would have been an unseemly *disjunction of, or distance between* them. For had the HOLY GHOST proceeded from the FATHER *alone*, how could He have been joined with the SON? And had he Proceeded from the SON *only*, how should he have been united to the FATHER? Or had the first PERSON *begat* the other two, there would have been Two SONS, and no HOLY GHOST. Or had those two *Proceeded* from the first, there must have been two HOLY GHOSTS and no SON. And thus the *Procession* of the Divine SPIRIT as here accounted for, we see, is indispensibly needfull for the intrinsic Regularity, and meet Oeconomy, or Order of the TRINITY: that there should be a due *Connexion* of the PERSONS in it, to prevent an indecent *Separation of, or Confusion amongst* them. For from the best and closest Union of the HOLY THREE, which can consist with their

(f) Gal. 4. 6.

(g) Phil. 1. 19.

238 *An Antidote against Arianism.*

Personal Distinctions; results the Glorious Constitution of the **TRIUNE DEITY**, exclusive of all rude Chasm, and Disorder.

And this Nexus, or agreeable Knot whereby the **DIVINE Three** are so duly conjoin'd; is so far from being a *New Notion*, that I find it is as old as *Tertullian*. For he speaks of the **FATHER's** (h) connexion with the **SON**, and of the **SON's** with the **Paraclete**, whereby they so cleave together, as if the *Three were one out of the other*. And again, (i) *I take not the SPIRIT to be from any other but from the FATHER by the SON*. *Athenagoras* also fairly hints the *Procession* of the **HOLY GHOST**, where he calls him an (k) *Effluviu*m, or *Emanation* of **GOD**.

(h) Ita connexus Patris in Filio, & Filii in Paraclete tria efficiunt coherentes alterum ex altero. Contr. Prax.

(i) SPIRITUM non aliunde puto, quam a Patre per Filium. Ib.

(k) Ἀπὸ πνεύματος τοῦ ΘΕΟΥ. Legat. pro Christian.

A R-

ARTICLE XVII.

So there is One FATHER, not Three FATHERS; One SON, not Three SONS; One HOLY GHOST, not Three HOLY GHOSTS.

EXPOSITION.

A most natural and necessary Consequence of what has been premis'd. For the FATHER being made of none, neither created, nor begotten, but *Self-subsistent*; and the SON being neither made, nor created, but *Begotten*; and the HOLY GHOST being neither made, nor created, nor begotten, but *Proceeding* of the FATHER and the SON: how can there be more than one FATHER, one SON, and one HOLY GHOST? Yet that all those *must be, and how they are* is easy to apprehend. For the FATHER subsisting eternally of *Himself*; and the SON by *His* eternal *Generation* of Him; and the HOLY GHOST by eternal *Procession* from *Both*: the ways of Subsisting *proper* to each and *incommunicable* to the other; shew they are actually Three PERSONS (tho they be in one ESSENCE) and *how* they came to be so in a *general* way. Tho' to give in a clear Account of the *Modes* of those several divine Acts,

Acts, Self subsistence, Generation, and Procession; as it is beyond the Power of any *Men*, so it may be above the Capacity of all *Angels*. Yet still the PERSONS of a VITAL TRINITY are and will be most intelligible. So very plain and easy to be understood, that as not to apprehend them would shew heavy dullness in the Mind; so not to prefer a VITAL to the Modal TRINITY, might seem to indicate a Flaw in the Understanding; or else to imply intellectual *Perverseness* in the *Inapprensive*, or somewhat of *Stupidity*; the Speculation being so clear and regular.

But does the old Hypothesis of the TRINITY make the *Rise* of the PERSONS in it thus *intelligible*? Alas! instead of that, it involves and hampers it with inextricable Difficulties; and shuts it up in darkness and confusion, as has been shewed. And therefore as many as go upon *that*, will be in no danger of believing *three FATHERS, three SONS, and three HOLY GHOSTS*, (which this Article with excessive Tenderness *cantions* against:) but will find it *impossible* to make out to Satisfaction, that there is *one FATHER, one SON, and one HOLY GHOST* in the DEITY, truly and distinctly.

ARTICLE XVIII.

And in this TRINITY none is afore, or after other ; none is greater, or less than another :

But the whole three PERSONS are coeternal together and coequal.

So that in all things, as is aforesaid, the UNITY in TRINITY, and the TRINITY in UNITY is to be Worshipped.

EXPOSITION.

Tho' in the HOLY TRIAD there are several PERSONS, yet all of them being truly GOD, they must be alike both in *Being* and *common Perfections*. In *Being* because All are VITALITIES, and *Coeffential*. In *common Perfections*, because they are *Coequal*. For as in *Duration* they are *Eternal* ; and so none could be afore, or after other : so in Goodness, Mercy, Truth, Wisdom, Knowledge, Justice, Power, Glory, Expansion, and the like General Perfections ; none could be greater or less than another, every of them in such Attributes being *Infinite*.

R

It

242 *An Antidote against Arianism.*

It is said indeed by our Blessed LORD, *My FATHER is greater than I*, S. *Joh.* 14. 28. But then (as 'tis usually said) he spake in reference to his *Humanity*. And that he *certainly* did so, is manifest from the foregoing Words in the same verse; where he declares, *I go away, and come again to you. And I go unto my FATHER.* Which how could he do but in his *humane* Capacity? And his Manhood being here so plainly pointed at, the Comparison made in all likelihood must be betwixt GOD's *Divine* Nature, and CHRIST's *Humane* one: but not at all between their two Divine PERSONS, from whence their *Inequality* might be argu'd or inferr'd.

Yet still (without shifting or any hesitation) we *may*, and we *must* allow some kind of *Subordination* in the TRINITY. For tho' the Learned *Origen* says most rightly, (1) *the GOD and FATHER of all things is not great alone, for he communicated his Greatness to the ONLY BEGOTTEN:* yet we must consider that all the Greatness and Glory *he* has, and even his very PERSON too, being imparted to Him by GOD the FATHER; the Giver must be *greater* than the Receiver. Tho' then again we must think withal, that the *Greatness* or *Majesty* GOD gave to CHRIST, being every way *equal* to his

(1) Οὐ μόνον δὲ μέγας ἐστίν, ὁ τῶν ὅλων ΘΕΟΣ καὶ ΠΑΤΗΡ, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῆς μεγαλειότητος αὐτοῦ ΜΟΝΟΓΕΝΕΙ. Contr. Cel. li. 6.

own, bating that it was *deriv'd* from *him* : all the Difference it makes between *Him*, and His SON (and also between *Them* and the HOLY GHOST) is in orderly *Rank*, or *Disposition* ; not in diminishing *Inferiority*, or *Degradation*.

And as this Subordination springs up from the very *Constitution* of the TRIAD ; the FATHER being the *First* PERSON, subsisting of Himself ; the SON the *Second*, Begotten of Him ; and the *Third*, the HOLY GHOST, Proceeding from them Two : so the same is evident, very evident by the *Oeconomical*, or Regular *Carriage* amongst the Sacred PERSONS. For tho' the SON did never *send* the FATHER, because he is *above*, or *before* Him ; nor the HOLY GHOST the SON, for the same Reason : yet the SON *sends* the HOLY GHOST, and the FATHER has *sent* them Both.

Nor was this Doctrine of *Subordination* in the TRINITY unknown or untaught in the Church of old. For touching it *Tertullian* speaks thus. *So the FATHER is another [Distinct] from the SON, (m) while he is Greater than the SON.* And *how*, or *wherein* is he *Greater* ? He tells us, in *This* ; *(n) While one Begets, and the other is Begotten ;*

(m) Sic Pater alius a Filio, dum Filio major. Contr. Prax. cap. 9.

(n) Dum alius generat, & alius generatur ; dum alius mittit, & alius mittitur. *Ib.*

244 *An Antidote against Arianism.*

while one Sends, and the other is Sent. And soon after he notes the *Paraclete* to be another different from the SON, as the SON is from the FATHER. And as the SON stands in the *Second Degree of Order*, so the *Paraclete* is in the *Third*. And accordingly at the end of his Treatise against *Praxeas*, he calls the HOLY SPIRIT, *the Third Power of the DIVINITY, and the (o) Third Title of the MAJESTY*. So that tho' in the TRI-NITY none is afore or after other (all being infinitely, and so equally perfect:) yet amongst them there is, and must be a decent Order, and regular Subordination; and both naturally and immutably settl'd. For else how could one PERSON be always the *First*? another, the *Second*? and another, the *Third*? Or how could the *First* PERSON send the *Second*? *I will send my Be-loved SON, S. Lu. 20. 13.* Or how, could the *Second* send the *Third*? *I will send un-to you from the FATHER, the SPIRIT of Truth, S. Joh. 15. 26:* Especially when these Acts are not reciprocal. For where do we find that the SPIRIT ever Sent the SON? or the SON the FATHER? Good evidence of Divine Subordination in the TRIAD, fixt and inalterable.

(o) Tertium nomen Divinitatis, & tertium gradum Majestatis. *Ib.* cap. 30.

And when the Blessed TRIAD is such as has been describ'd (only much *Greater* and more *Glorious*;) what now remains for us to do? or what's more needfull by us to be done; than *most duly to worship the same*, as this Article piously directs? O let *this* then, let *this* be our chief care, as it is our great Duty. Let us fervently Love, and as zealously Serve the Adorable TRINITY with all constant Fidelity, in the best ways and measures we are able in our respective Stations and Capacities.

ARTICLE XIX.

He therefore that will be saved, must thus think of the TRINITY.

EXPOSITION.

No rash or extravagant, but a *wise* and well *weigh'd* Expression. For the only way to *Christian Profelytism* (as we are taught) is *Holy Baptism*. And by that Ordinance of CHRIST's own appointing, we are grafted into his Mystical BODY. And as by that Institution we are admitted into His Heavenly Religion; so at the same time we are *Baptiz'd in the Name of the FATHER, and of the SON, and of the HOLY GHOST*. And what is that less than to be dedicated to the

246 *An Antidote against Arianism.*

Belief and Acknowledgment; and devoted, or given up to the Adoration and Obedience of the Blessed TRINITY: Whence it follows unavoidably, that it is as reasonable and necessary we should own and worship This TRINITY in UNITY; as it is that we should perform our *Baptismal Vow*. And then as far as keeping that Vow is necessary to Salvation, so far it will be necessary for that Christian who would be saved, to *think rightly* of the Holy TRINITY, that so he may *rightly worship* it. And then so far as this *Creed speaks rightly* of That, we must believe it to be as *that* represents it (which is the grand Object of our Faith) if we would take the right course to be saved.

Eternal Salvation (which too many make light of) with good Christians is of all things the most valuable. And in order to gaining it, 'tis indispensably needful they should serve GOD duly. But then to qualify them for that, what can be more requisite than a true Idea of his Nature? And as that can be gather'd only from the Scripture, which alone can warrant it for genuine and authentick: so I can't but say, that the Description of the TRINITY (*GOD One in Essence, and Three in Persons*) contain'd in that part of this Creed hitherto consider'd; is very fairly drawn or taken out of those sacred Writings. Infomuch that where it calls the DIVINE THREE PERSONS, had it but
still'd

still'd them LIVES, or Vital PERSONS; I know not where it would have been defective. It would rather have been the most particular and clear, the most proper and natural account of the TRINITY that ever *was*, or perhaps that ever *can* be given. For as the Inspir'd Books, I'm apt to think, can yield no *better*; so we expect no farther Revelations than they afford.

And now let me here declare, that the great and unsufferable *Error*, in the *usual Doctrine* of the TRINITY; seems to have been *making the Essence to constitute the Persons; or the Persons to consist of the Essence*: neither of which can ever be. For if the *Essence* consists of *them*, or they consist of *that*; either way the *One* must actually be the *Other*: and then how can both subsist distinctly at once? or how can the Three Persons in that *Essence* be really distinct amongst themselves? Whereas the VITAL Hypothesis clears up and banishes these Difficulties. For so the *Essence* is as distinct from the *Persons*, as infinite *Spiritual Substance* is from infinitely perfect *Life*: and the *Persons* are as different from the *Essence* as the *Principle* *illivening*, is from the *Spirit* *illivened*. And then the Three Persons are as distinct *from one another*, as a *Life Self-subsistent*, a *Life Begotten*, and a *Life Proceeding* from Them two; can be distinct amongst themselves. And what need They? or how could they be more Distinct,

R 4

guisht,

guisht, and be Essentially one? But then according to the common Hypothesis, we may as well make the Number *One*, to be the Number *Three* (which the Great GOD Himself *cannot* do;) as shew how the One Divine Essence, can be Three distinct Persons. Did any yet ever make it out in so laudable a way; and to the general Approbation of the Intelligent; as that they had no just Exceptions against it? Or did they ever so throly explain the Doctrine of it, as to render it familiar to *ordinary* Christians as above hinted, and as every fundamental Article of their Faith, especially *this grand one*, ought to be? Alas instead of this, the Pens that have attempted to explain the Doctrine of it, have been miserably puzzl'd in striving to effect it. So plung'd and puzzl'd, that they have either made the three PERSONS in the TRIAD, to be *Three GODS*; or three *Dramatick* Persons instead of *proper* and *real* ones; or else have laht out into some *wretched Hæresy*: and when they have been pursu'd by smart Objectors against their faulty Assertions, have been fain to take Sanctuary in *pretended Mystery*, where there is none; the *Constitution* of the TRINITY being as *intelligible*, or more *easy* to be understood than our *own*. So that in short, how the Glorious GOD should be THREE in ONE, unless we allow the PERSON in his ESSENCE to be LIVES; I never yet could

appre-

apprehend; and am apt to think I never shall: tho' I should be glad to learn of any good Teacher.

In the mean time tho' it be extremely unhappy, yet we need not wonder to see People so much at a loss as they are, *for a right Notion* of the Blessed TRINITY. Some, we may observe *Doubt* of it, others *Deny* it, and others entertain *wild Opinions* concerning it. Yet this, I say, need not seem mighty strange, considering the *current Doctrine* of it. For that being so very gross and absurd, as to be both *unreasonable*, and *unintelligible* at once; what else can we expect should issue from, or be the natural Consequents thereof?

How *necessary* therefore, and again, I say, how *necessary* is it that the Good and Learned, who have true Piety and Zeal for GOD; should bend their Studies towards finding out, and clearing up this important Point. And for their encouragement they may be well assur'd, that the Subject is so Noble, Divine, and infinitely excellent; as to be most worthy of the best Pains they can bestow upon it. And to discountenance this where conscientiously done; would be next to endeavouring to *stifle the Truth*; and to keep the Christian World in ignorance as to the *chief Article* of their holy Religion.

I now conclude this *Exposition* with *one Corollary*, or additional Remark. Which as it is eminently contained *in*, so it may easily be gather'd *out* of the same. It

It is this. As the **TRINITY** in **UNITY** is the most Adorable, so it is the most reasonable Being, or the most agreeable to reason that can be. So we may partly learn from the ensuing Paragraphs.

For 1st. How *reasonable* is it that **GOD** the Creator of all Worlds, *should wonderfully excell all His Creatures*? And accordingly He does it *two ways*; both in the *Substance*, and in the *Constitution* of his Nature. In his *Substance*. For as that is the **DIVINEST SPIRIT** that ever was, or can exist; so in *Expansion* it is *infinite*: neither of which Excellencies any Creature can pretend to. And then He *excells* as much in his *Constitution*. For He consists of *Three PERSONS* in *One ESSENCE*. Which what Creature ever did, or can do?

2ly. And then those **PERSONS** (as in *reason* They ought) do actually *excell* as much in *high Quality* for their part; as the *Substance*, or *Essence* does, in which they are. For as they are all **LIFE**, so every one of them is a **LIFE** infinitely *Perfect*. And what can excell such **LIFE** in Dignity or Usefulness? Yet how *reasonable* is it that every **LIFE**, which is **GOD**, should be *such*? and that we should *believe* they are all **LIFES**, when Scripture gives Them that Denomination? And so in asserting they are **LIFES** I recommend no false or groundless Notions touching the **TRINITY**, when the Scrip-
ture

ture favours, or rather teaches the same; that the PERSONS are LIVES. And when in all high Points of Religion we ought to keep as much as we can to Scripture language; then more especially in *this*, the most *sublime* of all.

3ly. Nor can any thing be more *reasonable* than that these PERSONS which are really and distinctly *Three*, should *Essentially* be *One* GOD. For they all spring up naturally and eternally in that *Essence*, and will be the infinite GLORIES of it for ever and ever. And where *Three* have but *one* and the *same* *Essence*, how distinct soever They *otherwise* are; in *Reason*, and in Nature too, They must be an *essential Unit*, or *One* GOD.

4ly. That the *First* of those LIVES should be *Self-subsistent*, is most *rational*. For it being absolutely and infinitely Perfect; *Self-subsistence*, a most excellent Perfection, must be included in it. And truly had it not *been* so, according to *all Reason* that LIFE could never have existed; and then *all things* which now are, must have been *nothing* to Eternity, as has been said.

Yet that the *Second* LIFE should be *Begotten* by the *First*; and the *Third* *Breathed* by those *Two*; is as *rational* likewise. Not only because Scripture calls the *First* a *Father*, the *Second* His *Son*, and declares that the *Third* proceeds as a Spirit from *Both*: but because LIFE, we see, is every where *propagative* of it

252 *An Antidote against Arianism.*

it self on *Earth*; and why then may it not be the same in *Heaven*, in a suitable way?

And then that the Third PERSON should Proceed from the *other Two*, rather than be any way derived from the *Second* only, as *He* was from the *First*; there is good *Reason* also: because so the *Union* of the *Three* becomes close and *intimate* amongst Them All, which otherwise it could not have been. For thus They are all knit together by *Personal*, as well as *Essential* Unity. Whereas had the HOLY GHOST proceeded from the FATHER *only*, there could have been no Connexion between *HIM* and the SON: and had He proceeded from the SON *alone*, there could have been no Conjunction between *Him* and the FATHER. But by His proceeding equally from *Both*, They are all mutually and strictly conjoined. And I may safely say, that *here* is so Divine a Fellowship, and such a Vital Consociation; as never was, nor ever shall be in the World besides: as being compatible to the DIVINITY solely.

5ly. Again, Amongst the Glorious Three there is great *Reason* for respective *Subordination*. For when the *Second* is begotten by the *First*; and the *Third* is Breathed by Them *Both*: and where Being is imparted, as They that *give* it may justly *claim* Preference; so They that *receive* it are oblig'd to *yield* it.

6ly. But tho' there is Priority of Order amongst the Glorious Three; there can be nothing of *Inequality*; and for this High Reason. Because They are All *infinite LIVES*, and *infinitely Perfect* ones, and every one of Them GOD. But could any one of Them in his Nature be *less* than the other; that diminution would imply imperfection; which would inevitably sink him below the Rank of them DIVINE; and so undeify Him.

7ly. As the adorable PERSONS constitute the TRINITY, so for very great Reason They must consist of LIFE. Even because there is nothing else in the DEITY, which could multiply it self into PERSONS, without multiplying the GODHEAD. For That consists only of a Spiritual *Essence*, and the Three LIVES or PERSONS in it. But should that *one Essence* multiply it self into *three*, to become so many several PERSONS; there would presently be *Three GODS*, because there would be three Divine *Essences* really *Distinct*. And therefore there is (or at least to me at present there seems to be) *as much Reason* that the Glorious PERSONS should consist of LIFE, as there is that GOD should be *Three in One*, when He has so proclaim'd Himself. Which yet did not the PERSONS consist of LIFE, it would be hard to say *how* He could do so. For what is there else in the
DE-

254 *An Antidote against Arianism.*

DEITY, which They might intelligibly be constituted of? I say *intelligibly*. For a TRINITY in UNITY being the *chief Article in*, as well as *Object of* the Christians Faith; how could the infinitely Good and Wise GOD have recommended it to our Belief, had it been a *Mystery* not to be understood? Yet as such a *Mystery* it all along *was*, so the same in likelihood it *will continue to be*; unless we allow the Blessed PERSONS to be LIVES. Tho' that *that* Article in our *Religion* which is most fundamental, and necessary to be believed, should be most obscure, and impossible to be explained; may well seem improbable to the prudent, and indeed incredible too. Could we be bound to assent to what we can't understand, the most nonsensical Doctrines might be Articles of Faith; and even *Transubstantiation* amongst other Points might commence *Orthodox*. Nothing therefore ought to be impos'd as *necessary* to be believ'd, but what in the main is competently intelligible. Tho' here we must bar the *Modes* of things, into which no humane Sagacity can penetrate. But where therefore are we oblig'd to Believe them till we understand them?

8ly. Farther yet; It is most *Reasonable* that the VITALITIES, or PERSONS in the GODHEAD should be but *Three*. For in those Three the Principle of Divine LIFE (the sub-

sublimest, and noblest active Thing that ever was, or can be) is so far spent, as not to be capable of farther increase. So exhausted as to be unable to yield one LIFE more. In case it were not, it must in *reason* have gone on Multiplying still into a bigger Number. For where LIFE is *Necessary* as GOD's is, as nothing could hinder its existing from Eternity; so where it is *Almighty*, as *His* is too; what could bound or stop its Multiplicative Force? And therefore had not that been spent by Efflorescence into *Three* PERSONS; it would have proceeded to farther Fœtification. So that the true *Reason* why the prolific Energy of the Vital Principle in the DEITY terminated in the *Third* PERSON; was its Being so Emptied in raising the *Three*, that it could not yield a *Fourth*. As a *Fourth Dimension* can't be added to *Quantity*; no more can a *Fourth* LIFE be added to the TRINITY, of *like* Perfection. And as to one *deficient*, or short of the rest, it would be but a meer *Nullity*. For by reason of Meanness it could never come into their High Rank, but must stand Eternally excluded from their Sovereign, and most Sacred Order.

gly. But tho' these Divine LIVES are all *Perfect*, and all *Equal*; yet as they ought to be, They are *Rationally* and sufficiently *Distinguished*. For besides that the one is the *First*;

256 *An Antidote against Arianism.*

First ; the other the *Second* ; and the other the *Third* : They differ in *Title*, or *Relation* ; and by their *various Origins*. 1st, in *Title*, or *Relation*. So the first is a FATHER ; the second, a SON ; and the third, an HOLY GHOST. 2^{ly}, in their *different Origins*. So the FATHER rose by and from Himself ; the SON, by *Generation*, from the FATHER ; and the HOLY GHOST by *Procession* from the FATHER and the SON. And therefore tho' They are all of one *Nature* or *Quality*, namely LIFE ; yet They are really and evidently *distinguish'd*. So thro'ly and manifestly *Distinct*, that the SON can no more be the FATHER ; than He can beget *Him*, by whom He was begotten. And the HOLY GHOST can no more be the FATHER, or the SON ; than *They both* can Proceed from *Him*, who issued from *Them*.

3^{oly}. That the Three VITALITIES are real PERSONS, we have *Reason* enough to conclude from their *Personal Acts*, both *Inward*, and *Outward*. From their *Internal Acts* perform'd in the GODHEAD, as *Begetting* the SON, and *Breathing* the HOLY GHOST. And from *External* ones done in the World, too many to be enumerated.

Tho' we are not to think that bare abstracted LIFE is, or can be a Divine PERSON. For LIFE alone is but a most excellent *Power*, and *Principle* in the DEITY ; and never

sub-

subsists separately *from*, but is always actually *in* the Divine Essence, and is *Personated*, or becomes a PERSON by Conjunction *with* it. And as the *First* LIFE in Union with it constitutes the FATHER; so the *Second* does the SON; and the *Third*, the HOLY GHOST. Which still is very agreeable to *Reason*. For one LIFE does not so fill the divine Essence, as to render it incapable of two more. Tho' *That* may receive *Them*, and *They* may animate or quicken *That*, in very different ways; which *Modes* to us are all unknown.

Yet that there are *Three* LIVES in GOD, we have the more *Reason* to believe, because there are as *many* in every Man. And we may think it the less strange, that the first LIFE in the DEITY should be a FATHER; the second, a SON; and the third, an HOLY GHOST: when the first Life in Man makes him a *Rational*, the second, a *Sensitive*, and the third, a *Vegetative* Creature. Tho' why our *Lives* are not *Persons*, there is very great *Reason*, they being not *Divine*, nor *infinitely Perfect*, as those above are. Yet the *Lives* which are in us may be as suitable to our mean Nature, and as equal to our low Capacity; as those Divine Living PERSONS in the DEITY, are congruous and adequate to that infinitely Perfect BEING.

Itly. In all *Reason* there must be vast Difference between the *Vital TRINITY* in *UNITY*; and the *Modal* one. For in that consisting of *Modes*, the Divine *Essence* is the Three *PERSONS*; and each of those *PERSONS* is that whole *Essence*. An unheard of, and impossible Constitution, and such as *destroys*, necessarily destroys the very *Being* of a *TRINITY*. For to constitute *That*, there must be an *Essence* really *distinct* from the *PERSONS*; and the Three *PERSONS* must be really *distinct* from one another. But where the *Essence* is those *PERSONS*, and those *PERSONS* are that *Essence*; both the aforesaid needfull Distinctions are actually excluded, and a *TRINITY* as effectually put by, and utterly prevented. But then in the *Vital TRINITY*, tho' the *LIFES* be those *PERSONS*, and are in that *Essence*; yet they are as *distinct* from one another, as a *Second LIFE* begotten, can be *distinct* from the *First* which begat it: and as a *Third LIFE* which Proceeds from those Two, can be *distinct* from *both* Them from whom it issu'd. And thus the Three *distinct LIFES*, in conjunction with the *One Spirit*, or *Essence*, (which they all actuate) do truly and *rationaly* constitute a proper, and most perfect *TRINITY* in *UNITY*.

But this in the *Modal* one can never be done without bringing in *Three* GODS. For every of the PERSONS there being the whole *Essence*, admitting there are Three distinct PERSONS, as there must be; there will be Three Divine Infinite *Essences*, and consequently as many GODS. And methinks a learned Writer seems to own little less, where he thus delivers himself. (a) Every PERSON is the whole *Essence*, and in every PERSON there is the whole *Essence* of the DEITY.— And every PERSON is the whole and perfect GOD. Now if every PERSON be the whole *Essence* of GOD, and the whole and perfect GOD; and there be Three PERSONS in the DEITY: if those Three be distinct (as they must be to be PERSONS) how can They be less than Three perfect GODS?

Besides; in the *Modal* TRINITY, the PERSONS are but *nominal*, *titular*, and *figmentitious*; whereas in the *Vital* one They are not only real Living, but infinitely Glorious Agents. And so the *Vital* is as different from the *Modal* TRIAD; as a *natural* can be from a *feign'd* or *artificial* One: or as an infinite SPIRIT in which are Three infinite Di-

(a) Quælibet Persona est tota Essentia, & in qualibet Persona est tota Deitatis Essentia.— Persona quælibet est Deus totus & perfectus. *Polan. Syntag. Theo. l. 3. cap. 1.*

vine LIFES, differs from as many empty *Relative Titles* given to that SPIRIT. And therefore as the *Modal One* is cloudy, obscure, and so confus'd as to be inexplicable; the *Vital One* is *Rational* in all respects, and instead of being deeply *Mysterious*; is very intelligible, and easy to be understood, so far as 'tis necessary we should apprehend it. Tho' if we know not so fully as we would, how the Three LIFES are in GOD; that should not hinder our believing that they *there* exist; when we know better (as has been shew'd) how *they* exist in the DEITY, than how our *own* do in *our selves*. So that according to the *Vital Hypothesis*, the TRI-NITY can no longer be a profound Mystery; as indeed the most Learned Writers of it have ever accounted it. Nay, the truth is, by their painful Studies they *made* it so; For while they labour'd to clear it up, they did but darken it, and by endeavouring to explicate it, made it more obscure.

But then from these *Speciminal Instances* (to which more might be added;) all that have any intellectual Eye-sight, may see the *Reasonableness* of this Doctrine of the Holy TRINITY, beyond the other: and also the *laudable Congruity* of that Hypothesis *whereon it is founded*. By virtue of which, as the Mists of Ignorance which obscur'd the TRI-AD, are competently dispell'd; so the Intricacies

cacies that us'd to attend, and help'd to perplex it, are fairly solved, or set aside; and its native Beauties and adorable Glories which can't be comprehended, are more plainly discover'd. So that now it is no longer unsearchable and obscure; but rather an open bare-fac'd, all-glorious Being, *Three in One*, without a Mystery. Three infinitely Perfect LIVES in One infinite Spiritual Essence. And as those LIVES spring up there, united to it, and respectively actuate it; they are the *Three PERSONS* in it.

Now therefore let us cease to do, as it has been done: that is, to invent mean and false Notions, and then to fix them on the true GOD. To make meer *Relations* adorable PERSONS, and imaginary *Modes*, Almighty Powers; when at best they were but admir'd *Nothings*. Surely it is time, high time to grow wiser now. Should the Learned have made *Angels*, *Men*, or *Children*, to be *Modes*; should they have made *Eagles*, *Elephants*, or *Whales* to be *Modes*; nay, should they have made but *Worms*, and *Flies*, and *Fleas* to be *Modes*: that would have been wild and mad enough of conscience. But for the top, or flower of the Learned, to make the Glorious PERSONS in the GODHEAD but *Three Modes*; what shall I say to it? Truly I will only say *this* with Seriousness and Grief. *From hence let us every one learn, to*
beg

262 *An Antidote against Arianism.*

beg earnestly of GOD to lead us into his heavenly Truth, and always to keep us in the same. If He does not, be our *Learning* never so great, we here see by sad Examples, how woefully we may plunge into *Error*, and how very deep we may sink in it, and how long it may be before we rise out of it, if we ever do.

The Summ of All.

In the infinite and eternal Essence of the GODHEAD there are Three Infinite Eternal LIVES. The *First* of which eternally actuates and illivens that Essence, and so becoming the First PERSON in it, as the FATHER there eternally Begat the SON. The *Second*, eternally actuates and illivens, that Essence, and so becoming the Second PERSON in it, is the SON there Begotten of the FATHER. The *Third* eternally actuates and illivens it, and so becoming the Third PERSON is the HOLY GHOST there eternally Proceeding from those Two. So that in short, here is a true, clear, tripersonal TRINITY. And then these Three LIVING PERSONS being in that One Essence, and all actually illivening the same; there is as true and clear an Essential UNITY. And if this be not a most Glorious TRINITY in UNITY, what is? And if it is not easy to be understood, what can be? 6 JU 62

Let

Let me but add. I am inclinable to think, that *these* were the very *Notions* which the School Doctors, and others more learned drove at, and propos'd to themselves to find out; could they have hit upon them. But mistaking right measures they mis'd of their End, and fell short of the high Mark they aim'd at.

Now that important Doctrine of the Adorable TRIAD which they were at a loss for, I am almost willing to hope is found out. And as the First Part of my *Essay* was *introductive* to it; and the Second Part *explicative* of it: this *Exposition* more plainly exhibits and confirms it. In case it be so, *not unto us, O LORD, not unto us, but to Thy NAME give the GLORY.*

F I N I S.

BOOKS *printed and sold by H. and
G. Mortlock, at the Phoenix in St.
Paul's Church Yard.*

AN Essay towards shewing the Reasonableness of the Doctrine of the Holy and Undivided Trinity; or at least the great Reasonableness of Believing it. In Two Parts. Being a Letter occasionally written by *Erasmus Warren*, Rector of *Worlington* in *Suffolk*, to his Son.

6 JU 62
The Duty of absolute Submission to the Will of GOD. The Nature and Benefit of Afflictions. The General Uncertainty and Shortness of Humane Life; and the final Doom of impenitent Sinners; manifested in Four Discourses. Suitable to the present times, and recommended to Christians of all Perswasions. By *Robert Warren*, A. M. Rector of *Charlton* in *Kent*.

nd
St.

na-
bly
eat
wo
ten
in

the
t of
and
inal
sted
sent
f all
M.